THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. LXXXVII.] MARCH, 1852. [Vol. VIII.

POPULAR EDUCATION.*

Rapid and extensive is the progress which the question of Popular Education has made within the last few years. Its more decided steps may be dated from the year 1847, when a few persons of various religious denominations, bewailing the failure of previous efforts as well as the prevalent ignorance and vice, associated themselves together, and drew out a plan, the immediate sphere of whose operation was intended to be the county of Lancaster. Having put their views before the public, and taken active measures for making them known, they met with such sympathy and obtained such support that, in the year 1850, they found themselves in a condition, nay, were almost necessitated by the general demand, to make their Society national both in name and in extent of operation. This marked success had the effect of calling into activity two rival parties. One of these were the Voluntaries, as they are called. Holding that resources for the establishment and maintenance of popular education should be derived from voluntary bestowments, a number of persons, connected chiefly with the Independent and Baptist bodies, came forward, with Mr. Baines, the proprietor of the Leeds Mercury, at their head, in order to withstand the efforts of the National Educationists, and induce the public to leave popular education to the free-will offerings of Christian benevolence. As yet, however, the friends of what is termed "voluntaryism" or "willinghood" have met with only partial success. Their public advocates are men of ordinary ability and small social power. Having some strength in virtue of their connection with Dissenting Sunday-schools, they possess no influence with the mass of the people, and can but faintly make their voice heard in Parliament. Having in their ranks some men who are used to the platform and ready with the editorial pen, they command the public ear and assume a social position, but they have little organization and inconsiderable funds. Sufficiently compact and sufficiently powerful to make now and then a demonstration on a second-rate scale, they somewhat effectually play their part in obstructing the exertions of others, and so avail to delay the settlement of the Educational question. While they thus hinder and postpone a national provision for a great national want, they disown the obligation of taking measures for the general education of the people, and do little within their own particular sphere for the augmentation and improvement of their present

* A Bill to establish Free Schools in England and Wales for Secular Instruction.

A Bill for promoting Education in the Municipal Boroughs of Manchester and Salford, and in the contiguous Townships of Broughton, Pendleton and Pendlebury.

educational appliances. The position which they thus occupy before the eye of the nation is not an enviable position, and for themselves and the religious interests they represent it would be well if they considered whether its inevitable tendencies are not to diminish their legitimate influence in the direct ratio in which they realize their obstructive purposes. The success of the Voluntaries can, we believe, be but partial and temporary. This seems to be indicated by the rapid diffusion of principles opposite to theirs. Already does there exist a widely-spread conviction of the necessity of some new and adequate effort on behalf of popular education. In vain has Mr. Baines been great in statistics intended to prove the reverse. In vain have he and his fellow-labourers declared that we are going on very well. The public say, and say truly, that we are going on very ill, that our material expansion and our material prosperity are fast outrunning the intellectual and moral appliances by which only that expansion and that prosperity can be made a real and permanent good. In truth, our actual educational provision is both defective and deficient. It fails in amount, it fails in quality. It lamentably fails in both. This is well known to all who have looked at facts with impartial eyes. This is known and acknowledged by the public. So certain is the fact, that no one about to address a general audience on popular education would, if acquainted with the prevalent state of mind thereon, venture to employ arguments or occupy time to establish such a position. Such arguments would not obtain a hearing; such a waste of time would not be endured. With men of intelligence and enlarged sympathies, nor least with such men in the humbler ranks, the point is considered as proved beyond the possibility of refutation. Some from reading and observation, others from their own painful experience, know that our popular school system is bad in quality and in quantity, and they regard any attempt to prove to them the contrary as little better than an insult to their understandings.

In this state of feeling it is very natural that men of common sense should look with little favour on the sayings and doings of those who cry, "Let things be," "Let things alone," or who bid the public trust to the natural result of their own eloquent appeals. Such a policy looks too much like an indefinite postponement of a matter which least of all others will bear postponement. In popular education is involved the very life of the nation. It is not too much to say, that even the value of property depends on popular education. Our civil liberties, our moral weal, our religious health, are all most intimately bound up with popular education. Nay, our commercial prosperity and our national independence are concerned with the question. By ourselves, however, the matter is regarded chiefly in its relation to individuals. With grief do we think of the thousands who in this Christian land are lost,—yes, lost to all that is good, to all that Christians profess to love and to revere,—lost to God, to eternity,—lost to the church of Christ, lost to society, to their families and to themselves, every successive year, for want of a good training in childhood and youth. This huge evil ought no longer to be tolerated. Too long, far too long already, has this moral, intellectual and social waste been suffered. It is high time that the question was taken out of the hands of sectaries and speculatists, and by large-hearted, intelligent, practical men, brought to a satisfactory termination. For the cause of Nonconformity, of which these

Voluntaries consider themselves the special representatives, we have a profound respect. Some of their principles we hold to be sound and valuable. Individuals among them deserve the high social esteem in which they are held. Others, however, appear to us to be no less narrow in their views and crotchetty in their notions than pertinacious in their efforts. They think of their sect more than of their country, and measure the educational condition of England by the condition of their own chapel-school. Accustomed to make the school the nursery of the congregation, they look with aversion on anything that is likely to abate the efficacy of such a means of proselytism. And valuing more the enforcement of their own peculiar dogmas than the advancement of the general welfare, they have set themselves more or less decidedly against all the chief movements for the general furtherance of popular education within the last five-and-twenty years, until now they are in danger of losing that share in the results of the settlement of the question to which they are entitled by the strength, zeal and benevolence of the denominations with which they are connected. Chiefly, however, are the Voluntaries in the wrong in what they call their principle. What is that principle? They call it "voluntaryism," "willinghood." The ideas are as loose as the words are new. Let us take the Saxon term, as more easy of general comprehension. "Willinghood" does or will do what is needed in popular education. Whose willinghood? That of the people themselves? The assumption is contradicted by fact. The willinghood of the sects? Why, that is the very thing that has left us in our present unsatisfactory condition. The willinghood of individuals? It is utterly insufficient for the task. The willinghood of property? Property avoids its obligations. The fact comes out in the fullest evidence in the Reports of Her Majesty's Educational Commissioners. Besides, what does this willinghood mean? Unless there be willinghood on the part of the nation, a national provision can never be made. A nation willing to tax itself for popular education does not depart from willinghood. Here, then, voluntaryism has no distinctive ground. Is, then, the required willinghood found in the payment of the contribution? The payments which voluntaryism actually obtains can be called voluntary contributions only by a straining of the terms employed. They are for the most part not free-will offerings, not spontaneous gifts, but imposts rated in committee, enjoined in the pulpit, and enforced on the platform. They are the fruits not so much of individual benevolence as of sectarian organization and oratorical excitements. Real willinghood, we opine, would produce even less than is produced by "denominational" zeal. The efforts dictated by that zeal we do not blame. It is the logical position of Voluntaries we are examining, and that position we pronounce too diminutive and too vague to be a sufficient source for supplying a great permanent and growing national want.

In one department of benevolent effort a practical voluntaryism, so to term it, has rendered valuable services. We allude to the Sunday-school system. But the Sunday-school system owes its efficiency to its essentially religious character. Of its general working as a religious instrument we hold a very high opinion. To that operation we would give augmented scope and efficacy both in quality and in extent. The benefit may be bestowed most effectually by relieving the Sunday-school

of the duty of secular instruction, and by sending into the Sunday-school a succession of pupils prepared for its teachings by a sound and comprehensive training in general knowledge. In this way the Sunday-school would be employed in that which it can well perform, and be relieved of that which it has in part neglected and in part done ill. We blame not the Sunday-school for its deficiencies. We only wonder at the amount of its good. But we wish to understand the exact service which it is fitted to render. That service is a religious service. So is it declared to be by fact. So must it be in consequence of its very character as a Sunday-school, that is, an appendage to a religious organization. In performing a religious task, it applies voluntaryism to its appropriate purpose. In religion, voluntaryism is strong because it is right; and it is strong because in religion Christian culture, rather than knowledge or science, is required,—that general Christian culture which may be found in every one who possesses the Christian spirit and endeavours to live a Christian life. The qualifications, then, that are specially needed in the Sunday-school are not scantily supplied in the ordinary members of Christian churches. But that such members are commonly deficient in the means for communicating a good secular training, is a fact patent to all who take an interest in these questions. Let the Sunday-school continue its religious work. Let it also be ready and glad to relinquish its merely secular tasks. Let it too hail the prospect of increased usefulness, when it shall be enabled to concentrate all its power on its own appropriate religious duties.

Most opportunely did the Sunday-school come into existence at a time when the commencement of our great manufacturing undertakings gave an impulse to population, and occasioned new intellectual and moral wants on a large scale and of a very urgent description. We gratefully acknowledge the aid as a gift of Divine Providence. But there is one result which we cannot but regret. The Sunday-school has rivetted the connection between secular and religious instruction. The necessity of both we fully recognize, while we deprecate their union. That union we owe originally to a state of society essentially dissimilar to our own. In the middle ages all knowledge was in the hands of the priesthood. With the priesthood, therefore, lay the duty of communicating secular as well as religious instruction. But in anterior periods the union did not exist. The union was unknown to the classic civilization. The union was equally unknown in the early days of the Christian church. Paul was too much engrossed with preaching "Christ crucified," to find time for giving prelections on the Greek poets with whom he was familiar. The Christian Fathers looked on Pagan literature, which then comprised all secular knowledge, with suspicion or dislike. The first universities did comprise chairs of theology, but it was because they were universities, that is, schools of *universal* knowledge. But they did not commit the practical absurdity of entrusting secular and religious instruction to the same hands. It was only when the laity gave themselves to war, and left the cultivation of letters to the clergy, that the union we deprecate took place. The cause of that union exists no longer, and many are the reasons why the union itself should cease to be. To a great extent the union has come to an end. Our universities and our schools do indeed retain certain religious forms, but those forms are devoid of life, and rather injure than benefit religion. In truth, the

revival of letters in the days of Luther virtually sundered the connection. The new knowledge, or the love and study of classical literature, almost superseded the old and decaying scholastic religion. First in the grammar-school, and then in the university, the secular element gained predominance, and almost banished religious instruction. And even now, after the great religious revival of the last hundred years, the Classics and the Mathematics are all but exclusively studied at Oxford and Cambridge. Even the professed teachers of religion are compelled to get their religious knowledge as they can. Skilful in scanning the broken stanzas of a Greek play, they are ignorant of Isaiah's sublime verse; they may contrive to make out the meaning of Thucydides on the Peloponnesian War, but are dunces if required to translate and expound the message of peace, the publication of which is narrated by the evangelists. We cite a sufficient proof in the words of the Bishop of Manchester, found in a Charge* delivered so lately as November, 1851:

"In all my examinations for orders I have been painfully struck with the little acquaintance shewn by many of the candidates with the original text of the New Testament. I would urge this seriously on the attention of the younger clergy. Critical and accurate knowledge, though not of itself necessary to salvation, is all-important to the teacher and expounder of God's word." (P. 45.)

Equally in our middle-class schools has the intimate union of religious with secular knowledge been dissolved. The heads of those establishments limit themselves to the intellectual and moral training of their pupils, leaving their religious education in the hands of parents and ministers of religion. This course they could not have pursued had it not been approved by their patrons. The middle classes, then, have in the most emphatic manner declared themselves in favour of this separation. In so doing they have manifested their customary good sense. Why, then, should the union be forced on the humbler classes of society? Alas! the humbler classes have been the hunting-grounds of the sects. The hunting-grounds of the sects it is wished they should still be. In so predatory a desire, the sects find an ally in the Sunday-school. There the union all but dissolved in general society, was consummated afresh. There does the union still subsist, sustained on a very small portion of secular knowledge and a very large portion of religious sentiment. The union subsists, and is vigorously defended. Yet will it be broken by the increasing power of the spirit of the age. In the Sunday-school the union presents itself in its worst aspect relatively to the secular element, but relatively to the religious element the union is seen in its worst aspect in sectarian day-schools. That union is a gift of the Sunday-school to the day-school. Receiving that gift, the day-school has consigned both secular and religious instruction to one pair of hands, one head and one heart. But the day-school is specially bound to give attention to the secular element; inevitably, therefore, does it neglect the religious element. Had it been the object to devise the worst possible means for giving a bad religious education, the religious education of the people would have been consigned to the ordinary master of a day-school. Here, again, we speak

* The Charge itself offers another proof that a man may hold high office in the Establishment and be a first-rate classical scholar, without being able to write even correct English.

more in sorrow than in anger. How can even the best master of a popular day-school give his pupils a good religious education? Having at least some hundred boys to educate secularly as well as he may, he has only too much to do; his hands are overburthened, his mind is too heavily taxed, his heart is oppressed, his spirits are worn; and well is it, and most meritorious, if under his load and in his difficulties and struggles, he can maintain and manifest some portion of the Christian spirit of patient endurance and long-suffering kindness. More, who can give? More, who has the conscience to require? Yet more is required. How uselessly the requirement is made, let those declare who are acquainted with the actual condition of our primary day-schools. With exceptions we have here nothing to do. Speaking generally, we declare, and know that we are justified in declaring, that our popular day-schools do not give a religious education. The utmost that is attempted beyond a general supervision, not always of the best kind, and a general Christian influence, which is painfully but inevitably small and defective, is the unintelligent communication of such words and phrases as catechisms and other formularies present. Let our readers carry their thoughts from some one or two well-conducted schools, the excellence of which is owing to their own special influence, or to the rare qualities of the masters, or, again, to the predominating influence of a large town, and perhaps the immediate proximity of some educational agitation; let the thoughts, we say, be carried from these exceptions to the length and breadth of the land, to ordinary day-schools, to say nothing of the inferior ones; or let our readers peruse the Reports made to the Committee of Privy Council on Education,—and they will at once acknowledge that nothing worthy of the name of religious education is given in these establishments; and strange if they are not also fully convinced of the necessity of an entire change of the existing system. However that may be, we mark the fact that at present a religious education is not given in our day-schools. Instead, something worse is done; a pretence is made to give such instruction. A pretence is made, and such a pretence, alas! as satisfies thousands, and prevents an imperatively demanded change. That change must come; and it can come only by relieving the overloaded hands of the schoolmaster, and specifically by devolving on others duties for which the schoolmaster has no specific training, and nothing special but disqualifications. Such relief involves the separation of religious from secular instruction. Throwing on the minister of religion his own specific duties, it leaves the schoolmaster at full liberty to employ all his resources and all his energies in his own proper functions, which, in consequence, we may expect to find much better discharged than they are at present. We should, however, very insufficiently express our convictions, did we not add that the schoolmaster must be still farther relieved in having devolved on his care for secular instruction a much smaller number of pupils than he has now the charge of; and only when his task shall cease to be so disproportionate to his powers, can we hope to find him exerting that moral and generally Christian influence in his labours which a conscientious man would wish to exert, and which such a man could exert, to the very great increase and improvement of his influence, and to the very great satisfaction of every enlightened friend of popular education.

We have adverted to efforts already made for the extension and improvement of popular education. In doing so we referred chiefly to the Committee of Privy Council on whom the task has been devolved. To the exertions of that body the nation is greatly indebted. From the continuance of those exertions we may expect still more ample benefits. Yet do we find it impossible to rest in the provision thereby made for the advancement of popular education. The Committee, it has been alleged, is unconstitutional. It may be unconstitutional. Certain, however, we are, that it is only in part responsible. Is it responsible to Parliament? Why it only appears before the House of Commons once a year in a general way to receive an already allotted sum of money, the bestowal of which is supported by all the power of the Government. Is it responsible to public opinion? The bulk of intelligent men are ignorant of the names of its members, and equally ignorant of the precise nature of its functions. Its very character as a Committee screens it from responsibility. A Committee is a mere abstraction; you cannot lay hold of it, you cannot bring it to book. The individuals of which it consists are not the Committee. A and B have no responsibility. "It is not my act," they each plead, "but the Committee's." Yet, while the name shelters the proceedings, those proceedings are generally the work of some one person. Specially is this the case in "the Committee of Council on Education," since "my Lords," as the members are termed by their Secretary, are public men, political men, engrossed with ordinary affairs of state. Besides possessing no special qualification for the high office of national educators, they are no less compelled than glad to devolve on some one else duties to which they feel themselves unequal. The consequence is, that they choose a Secretary on whom falls the duty which the Prime Minister assigned to the Committee. It is undeniable that the real power of the Committee formerly was in the hands of its first Secretary, Sir James Kay Shuttleworth. At present, some one who signs himself "R. R. W. Lingen" is our educational autocrat. We do not suppose that the Secretary departs from the ordinary rules of public business, but those who know how Committees discharge their functions will be well aware that, practically, the chief control will be in the hands of R. R. W. Lingen. That functionary indeed conducts his correspondence in the name of the President of the Council. But the President of the Council, loaded as he is with duties, honours and years, must, together with his associates in office, depend very much on the Secretary. And thus, among the Committee as a body and as a number of individuals, its head the President, and its Secretary, where is the public to look for a real, practical responsibility? Yet a body constituted as is this Committee is specially open to partial influences, surrounded as it is by all the powerful representatives of a court, an aristocracy and a hierarchy. How can it escape those fascinations? How can it help leaning to those powers? With the most impartial desires and upright intentions, it can hardly avoid giving preferences where no preferences are due, and leaving unassisted the very parties that chiefly need assistance. For effectual counteractions to such perverting agencies we look in vain. No popular element enters into the constitution of the Committee. No direct means does it possess of becoming familiar with the wants and sympathies of the very

class for whom in the main it is appointed to labour. All its members and all its functionaries belong to the middle and the higher ranks. Of the people they know nothing but by report; with the people they have no contact; and therefore for the people are they unfit to legislate. In truth, there is in the constitution of this Educational Board the fundamental vice of all unrepresentative government; it works for, but it works without, the people. Wise beneficence in working for, works also by, the people. Not until the people take part in their own education, will they be well educated. Then only will their confidence be complete. Then only will their most necessary co-operation be secured. Then only will their real wants be understood and receive an effectual supply. The present system is a system of charity. By charity funds are raised on the part of individuals, and the deficiencies of their charity are made up out of the public funds. All is done for, and nothing by, the people, who are thus treated as educational paupers. Yet the most necessitous are left totally unprovided for. As we have just intimated, the beginning of a new school effort lies with charitable individuals. The Committee of Council gives only to those who have. We cite the words of its present Secretary, as found in a letter addressed to "The Lord Bishop of Winchester," dated February 7th, 1851:—"The Parliamentary grant has from the first been voted on the understanding that the bulk of the expenditure on education would continue to be raised *from other sources.*" If there are no other sources, no aid can be procured from the Parliamentary grant. The very districts, classes and individuals that most need assistance, receive no assistance whatever. Yet the needy are the dangerous members of society. With them chiefly is ignorance found, with all its inevitable train of evils. What friend of his country can be satisfied with such a state of things? Ought such a state of things to be perpetuated? Ought any step to be taken which sanctions and confirms such a state of things?

It scarcely needs to be added that nearly the whole Parliamentary grant goes into the hands of the wealthiest religious bodies. Here, however, is the proof. We quote from "the Family Almanac:"

"Amount of all grants confided to the Committee of Council on Education up to August, 1850		£892,669
Deduct balance in hand	£251,158	
Deduct cost of Kneller Hall, &c.	41,808	
Deduct cost of administration	82,323	
Total deductions		375,289
Total expended.....		£517,380

"Hence we find that the whole sum actually spent in the direction contemplated by the grant is £517,380; that the expenses of administration have been £82,323, that is, about 20 per cent.; and, lastly, that upwards of a quarter of a million sterling has actually been *saved* by the Committee which existed for no other purpose than to expend it.

"Again, the general rule of the Committee is to make grants proportional in amount to the sums raised by applicants. This principle is happily not rigidly adhered to. Still it is the rule, and, so far as it is not departed from, it is vicious. The two considerations which ought to regulate the amount of a grant are these:

"1. The proportion of the amount raised to the wealth, i.e. as represented by the rateable value, of the parish or the district.

"2. The numbers it is required to benefit.

"The rules, however, being just the reverse, it follows that rich districts, well able to raise funds, are liberally encouraged by Government; while poor districts, where education is most required, are allowed to remain in their present condition.

"Lastly, the amounts received by the different denominations are as follow:

Church-of-England Schools	£404,622	8	8
British and Foreign Society	50,672	15	11
Wesleyan Schools	8,032	3	4
Roman Catholic Schools	1,049	16	1."

Thus does the Church obtain the lion's share; and thus does the present system appear to be in reality a new Episcopal endowment under the guise of popular education. National funds are every year appropriated to the advancement of a religious body already found too powerful for religious equality and the growth and development of free thought. Let us here not be misunderstood. So highly do we value education, so imperatively needful do we hold popular education to be, that even this price we are willing to pay for it—if this price must be paid. But does such a necessity exist? We cannot assume its existence. Its existence must, if possible, be prevented. Nor are we without hope in the result of the efforts which are being made to secure for the people a good general training apart from the extraneous and defiling influences of dogmatism and sectarianism.

National education is a question which in the main ought to be considered from a national point of view. Such is the view which we are endeavouring to take. Yet we cannot forget that we are Dissenters. Still less can we forget that we are Unitarians. In both capacities, many of our readers have made and are making great efforts and greater sacrifices. For such efforts and such sacrifices they claim no merit. They are demanded by conscience. But the same imperative power equally demands allegiance in regard to popular education. Higher considerations—if there are any—may in that particular qualify or even annihilate the demand. And we are of opinion that no religious body has so great an interest in the spread of general intelligence as the Unitarian community. Nevertheless, that community can be required to acquiesce in an erroneous theological training for the people, only when it has been clearly and fully ascertained that the adventitious and injurious element is of inevitable necessity. There are signs which make us question the existence of such a necessity. Those signs Unitarians may justifiably hail; to those signs they may be expected to give encouragement. And in Lancashire we know they have not altogether failed in the duty. Among our proofs we will advert to that which is found in the proceedings of an aggregate meeting of Unitarians held in the Cross-Street chapel, Manchester, April 6th, 1847, James Heywood, Esq., in the chair. On that occasion Dr. Beard fully pointed out the sectarian tendencies and effects of the Minutes-of-Council system. We quote from a report of the meeting as found in the Christian Reformer, Vol. III., N. S., 1847, p. 298, &c.

"Dr. Beard expressed himself as willing to accept the measure rather than leave the actual ignorance, vice and misery unmitigated, but urged the necessity of demanding certain specified improvements in it, particularly that the

inspectors should cease to have supervision over religious instruction. The required supervision was indeed restricted to Episcopal schools; still, as the inspectors were national servants, they must be regarded as a new order of established teachers of Episcopacy and Trinitarianism. The influence of these Episcopalian instructors was very great. Out of nine inspectors, virtually appointed by the Bishops, five, he knew, and he believed more" (now ten at least), "were clergymen of the Establishment. In each of the seven or eight examinations which their scholars had to pass through, these clerical inspectors were required to see that the pupils were thoroughly drilled in 'Church-of-Englandism.' It was not right to make the nation pay for this sectarian teaching. How could Unitarians conscientiously pay these men for teaching and enforcing the Athanasian Creed, which, among other things, taught that all who did not believe as it prescribed would 'without doubt perish everlastingly'?"

These statements, which the speaker followed up with specific instances and proofs, found confirmation on the part of Mr. W. Rayner Wood, who said,

"He could more particularly confirm what had been stated by Dr. Beard in reference to the Reports of the clerical inspectors; for having read those Reports, he had found in them many things which he thought improper and objectionable. But whilst he deeply regretted that Her Majesty's Government should not have proposed to the country a *good general system of secular instruction, leaving religious instruction to be given by the ministers of different faiths*, he felt that it was necessary to take into consideration the amount of opposition which such a measure would have had to encounter."

As a result of its deliberations the meeting adopted a Memorial addressed to the Marquis of Lansdowne as Lord President of the Committee of Council on Education. In that document, which was presented to the noble Lord by a Deputation, the memorialists, among other things, declare that "they would rejoice, above all, to see established throughout the country a comprehensive scheme of *national education*, by which the mass of the population should be provided with sound mental, industrial and moral training,—the children of different faiths should be taught in the same school their common duties, and learn a spirit of mutual respect and toleration,—and instruction in the religious principles of particular denominations should be left to the teachers of those denominations."

In the same year, at the annual "Provincial Meeting of the Presbyterian and Unitarian Ministers of Lancashire and Cheshire," Dr. Beard submitted the following resolution:

"That considering the great diversities of opinion prevalent in this country in regard to religion, and the value of that discipline and immediate supervision which results from self-government, this meeting holds that the best educational system for Great Britain would be one in which the inhabitants of the several cities, towns and districts should be empowered and required to raise funds by local taxation, in order, in conjunction with actual and voluntary efforts, to support and promote a sound and comprehensive popular education of a purely secular kind, the entire direction of which should, with the aid of state inspectors, be in local Boards appointed by the ratepayers; while the ministers of religion in each part of the country are left at liberty to furnish such additional means of religious education as, according to their several views, they may judge proper."

Now, in the first place, we observe that the evils which these citations announce, and against the perpetuation of which they attempt to

guard, have since the words were uttered greatly increased. At present the nation supports the worship of the Virgin Mary as well as the Thirty-nine Articles, and lends its aid to uphold a despotical Conference as well as a narrow-minded Evangelicism, all under the guise of promoting popular education. Surely it ought to be a very strong necessity which can justify such lamentable indifferentism. And if in general the nation has reason to complain, how much more Unitarian Christians!

Did no better course present itself, Unitarian Christians might in largeness of heart be prompted to quietly acquiesce in an evil which they could neither prevent nor remedy. But there is a better course. That alternative is presented in the principles of "The National Public School Association." Of those principles we shall shortly speak in some detail. We advert to them now in order to draw attention to the fact, that, so far as they are fundamental, they are literally identical with those which are propounded by Mr. W. Rayner Wood, Dr. Beard and the Memorial. The words which we have underlined in our quotation from Mr. Wood's speech are a terse and complete expression of the basis of that Association. And that the Memorial is essentially in agreement with the objects of the National Association is evidenced (if evidence were necessary) by the fact, that the passage we have given from it was read by Mr. Wood to Lord John Russell on occasion of his Lordship's receiving, in January last, a Deputation from the Association in question. It may not be wholly irrelevant to add, that Mr. Wood intimated to the Prime Minister that the principle contained in those words received the assent of the Marquis of Lansdowne, the President of the Committee of Council on Education. Nor, indeed, can Lord John Russell in his own mind have been averse to that principle, since it differs little from that on which he himself acted in his proposals for the improvement of popular education made in the year 1839. Of the scheme which his Lordship then provided, the following were portions:

"Religious instruction to be considered as general and special:

"Religion to be combined with the whole matter of instruction, and to regulate the entire system of discipline:

"Periods to be set apart for such peculiar doctrinal instruction as may be required for the religious training of the children:

"To appoint a chaplain to conduct the religious instruction of children whose parents or guardians belong to the Established Church:

"The parent or natural guardian of any other child to be permitted to secure the attendance of the licensed minister of his own persuasion, at the period appointed for special religious instruction, in order to give such instruction apart:

"To appoint a licensed minister to give such special religious instruction, wherever the number of children in attendance in the model school belonging to any religious body dissenting from the Established Church, is such as to appear to this Committee to require such special provision."

So far as the payment of religious teachers is concerned, this plan differs from that of the National Association. In other respects it is substantially the same. That Association, then, considering its great and spreading influence, does offer to Unitarians a better course. Nay, that course is a course which originated in their own body. By Unitarians—as appears from the facts we have stated—was the essential idea of the National Association made public before that Society, or

its parent, the "Lancashire Public School Association," had come into existence. With such an alternative before them, Unitarians as a body may well be expected to give their best support to what has now become a great national movement. Let them only for one moment consider how small are the direct efforts which they can make for the advancement of their principles in their places of worship and their day and Sunday schools, when compared with the vast scale of counteraction which they encourage in supporting the present system of party-coloured, dogmatical training which is going forward in Episcopal schools, in Catholic schools, in Methodist schools, throughout England and Wales. Let them only realize these facts to their minds, and they will not long continue to uphold with one hand that which with the other hand they are attempting to pull down. If they think their distinctive principles of little value, why not disown them openly? Why not cease their efforts and close their chapels? But if they hold those principles to be scriptural, to be true, to be good in operation and effect, let them do nothing, let them endure nothing, which tends to render their efforts vain and make their sacrifices nugatory.

If the views and considerations which we have now set forth are in their general bearing sound and valid, they lead to some conclusions which at least serve to shew what any general system of popular education ought *not* to be.

1. A general system of popular education ought not to be left to the vagueness and uncertainties of what is called "the voluntary principle:"

2. It ought not to sanction the combination of religious with secular instruction, still less to consign the communication of the two to the overburdened and insufficiently qualified hands of the popular schoolmaster:

3. It ought not to be a mere supplementary adjunct to the partial and unsatisfactory operations of the Committee of Council on Education:

4. It ought not to supply means for cementing the connection that exists between Church and State, nor for promoting the spread of any particular form of doctrinal religion.

These negative conclusions will afford us effectual aid in the attempt which we proceed to make to ascertain what should be the main features of a measure which deserves the character and may hope to attain the position of a truly national provision.

It was for no theological purpose, nor under any narrow views, that the originators of the National plan studied the subject with which they undertook to deal. Bewailing the actual condition of popular education, they were led to investigate its causes. Those causes they found in the main to be the several influences which we have set before the reader. In influences which had produced failure they could not hope to find success. Something else and something more must be attempted. The want was national—national must be the supply. This point once recognized, gave a direction to all their determinations. But in arrangements for the future, existing agencies could not be overlooked. In England, civilization is progressive; it advances step by step, every second step implying a former one. It was therefore a duty to adapt the new that was contemplated, to what was already in existence. Hence resulted a general principle, namely, that while the best was sought for, the practicable should not be forgotten. A plan for

national education, therefore, must adhere to the past as well as improve the present; not an ideal, not an absolute, but an attainable good, must it attempt to secure. Hence the problem was how to get the best system in conjunction with existing agencies. In the solution of this problem, two things had to be borne in mind: first, that which was best in itself; secondly, that which must be conceded to the past. The largest amount of the former and the smallest amount of the latter were clearly justifiable aims. Somewhere between those two aims was the point where the Association was to take its stand. It was not an easy thing to ascertain and fix that point. To a great extent it was a point which could be determined only by experience. But experience comes by degrees. Accordingly, the Association has not inflexibly adhered to all its original details. We trust it will still remain open to judicious changes. One of its best effects, if it may not be also termed one of its chief objects, is the education of the public mind on the question of popular education, so as to lead to the adoption of a system which shall be good in itself, and work with ease and efficiency. Such an operation, involving an approach to an ideal good, requires variations corresponding with the progress of public opinion.

The Association, then, was led to see that its system of education must be first national, and secondly attainable. It must be national. Ireland had already been provided for in this respect. The provision to a large extent worked well. That provision separated religious from secular instruction, and recognized in the clergy of different denominations the instructors of the young in distinctive religious opinions. The separation was occasioned by the existence in Ireland of different bodies of religionists. In England similar diversities are found. Why, then, should not a similar separation of the secular from the religious element be adopted here?

However, as a satisfactory system of general education had been established in Ireland, Ireland did not come within the range of the Society's operations. Scotland, too, was advisedly excepted, for Scotland had an educational agitation of its own, which gave promise of issuing in satisfactory results. These restrictions left to the intended plan England and Wales as the sphere of its operation. In relation to England and Wales the plan is national.

Having a national aim, the plan must be national in extent. In order to be national in extent, it must have national support. But national support it could not command except its object was national. For its object to be national, it must undertake nothing but what had national acceptance. In regard to one branch of instruction the nation is of one mind. That branch is the secular. Who objects to secular instruction *as such?* Another kind of instruction—namely, religious instruction—is required. It is well; by all means let it be given. But it cannot be given out of national resources, because in regard to it great diversities of opinion prevail.

The value of secular education is admitted by all the friends and promoters of popular education. Here conscience says, "Give," not "Withhold." Does your conscience forbid you to teach arithmetic—geography—history? Does your conscience forbid you to combine industrial training with instructions in the art of reading and writing? Thus far we all go in common. Thus far, then, can we act together.

You wish for more. So do we; but what more? Joint action may take place as far as there is universal agreement: and we will go with you in pushing that joint action to its greatest extent. But in our journey we come to a point where we differ—differ seriously, differ at present irreconcilably. There let us stop. At the point where our differences begin must our joint action end. That point is doctrinal religion. And why must our joint action end there? Not only because there our agreement comes to a termination, but because religion is a matter which admits of no concession, of no compromise; because as soon as ever you enter its domain, the plea of conscience comes in to complicate, if not to prevent, joint action. Into the nature and validity of that plea this is not the time to enter. We mark its existence as a fact. As a fact of almost universal prevalence it must be recognized by the educational reformer. The Trinitarian pleads his conscience against contributing to the inculcation of Unitarianism in the way of popular education. The Unitarian, if consistent, must object to supply funds which he knows will be made to promote the spread of Trinitarianism. The Catholic and the Protestant are conscientiously in deadly conflict with each other, and cannot conscientiously support each other's religious opinions. Some may discover and acknowledge a religious element common to all Christians. The view may be correct. But the view is held by only a small number, and in consequence cannot form a basis for a system of national education. It is also supposable that some may not entertain the conscientious objection. They also are not numerous. It is true that as a nation we do object to support religious opinions which we repudiate. Even the Establishment, which is supported by national funds, refuses to receive the other sects into participation with itself in regard to religion, and for the most part in regard to education. But in matters of conscience the rights of minorities, the rights of even small minorities, demand and deserve respect. This has become a practical principle of the British Constitution. The recognition of this principle has been gained by innumerable conflicts and most costly sacrifices. The recognition may not yet be complete. But the tendencies of the age are in its favour; and in company with those tendencies ought an educational reform to proceed.

The plea of conscience, however, has been put in against a merely secular education. "Our conscience requires us to educate for time through eternity." By all means, obey conscience. No one presumes to think of hindering you. Follow out your convictions—pursue your own course—only do not ask me to supply the requisite funds. What you do, do on your own resources, and God be with you. If, however, such is your pleasure, we will lighten your burden. That part of your work which we in common regard as important, we are willing to perform out of a common fund. Will your conscience be thereby injured? You shall teach your own religion; we will teach that twice two make four. What can you object?

The error which we have exposed arises from a misconception of the National plan. That plan does not profess to give a complete education. Its aim is to supply a universally acknowledged good out of resources furnished by the nation at large. And the only valid objection would arise if it were shewn that the good it offers were not in itself a universally acknowledged good. So long as the good is co-extensive

(neither greater nor less) with the approbation which supplies the funds, so long conscience has no available plea adverse to the plan.

But it is said, the satisfaction afforded to conscience is more in appearance than in reality; for by supplying funds for secular purposes, you set at liberty funds to be applied to religious purposes. The allegation is incorrect. Our act is limited to the supplying of funds for secular purposes. For that act alone are we responsible. With that act alone are we concerned. What others may do in consequence of that act, is their concern, not ours. Is the objector to refuse to pay a debt because he to whom it is due may waste the amount in intoxication? Must the history of a sovereign, through all its possible adventures, be anticipated before it is justifiably allowed to be put into circulation? We dislike cupidity, but are not therefore at liberty to shrink from discharging a pecuniary obligation, because the payment or the gift may sooner or later augment a miser's hoards. By his own act must each one be judged. To his own conscience in the acts which he himself performs, is each one answerable. To make me answerable for my neighbour's conduct, is a gross injustice. The authority of conscience is strictly individual. It begins with yourself, and with yourself it ends. It extends to your own free-will acts, and leaves the free-will acts of others to themselves. The immediate application of your money, that application which depends on your own will, you are bound to look to. If you supply resources for secular education, their application to secular education you are under an obligation to secure. Where your intention ceases, there ceases your responsibility.

And this brings us to another case of conscience—one of a curious, not to say painful nature. Some Dissenters who have given support to the Episcopal or Local plan, represented by the second of the measures the titles of which form the text of this paper, have declared that while they could not approve of the expenditure of a public rate on religious purposes, they are required only to consider what the rate is asked for, and not what it may be applied to; consequently, as the rate is sought for secular education, they are justified in labouring for its imposition, though it may be made to teach and support religion. The justifiable disbursement of money depends not on the purpose of the asker, but on the purpose of the giver. If that purpose is not rigidly complied with, the money is misappropriated, and the person who makes the misappropriation is guilty of a delinquency. His delinquency can afford you no justification. No wise man will give money for one object, knowing or fearing it may be applied to another. And no upright man, foreseeing a misapplication, will do anything which may tend to occasion or promote it. All men in their ordinary concerns take due care to prevent the misappropriation of their money. Why not in relation to an educational rate? With this case of conscience we suspect conscience has in reality little to do. Strange is it that men should thus try to hoodwink themselves. Is it that at the bottom they have no objection to their money's being applied to religious purposes, though their position as Nonconformists compels them to study appearances by avowing only the secular appropriation?

These considerations bring us with increased evidence back to the conclusion, that a system of national education must stop short of express instruction in doctrinal religion. Here, however, a few words

of explanation are necessary. A national education must not teach religion. But what is religion? Where does the secular element end? Where does the religious element begin? Diversities of opinion prevail on the point. Some consider morals a part of religion. Others identify what is called "the Christian spirit" with the essence of religion. Let each one judge for himself, and let each one act according to his own convictions. But all are of one mind in this, namely, that doctrine is either religion itself, or an essential element of religion, as religion is generally understood and professed. Doctrinal religion, then, is the point which the national educator must not touch. Accordingly, the office of giving instruction in religious doctrine the National Association leaves to parents, guardians, and the recognized teachers of religion in the several denominations. Before, however, you come to doctrinal religion, there is a field in regard to which all are again of one opinion. Who will deny that it is right to teach a child to be truthful, honest, diligent, obedient, forbearing, forgiving, gentle and loving? And who will deny that even by his own personal authority, and in virtue of the force of his own upright, earnest, cultivated and affectionate character, the schoolmaster, if fit for his office, may do much, very much, to promote those high moral qualities in his pupils? Nay, a good man could not fail to exert a good moral influence in his school. His is a power which could in no way be nullified. It is as unavoidable as it is large, benign and powerful. That power the National Association recognizes. For the exercise of that power it takes effectual guarantees. "But," says the objector, "you have no motives whereby to enforce moral duties." The objection confounds the practice with the theory of moral obligation. The theory is for the college prelection, the pulpit and the congregational class-room. In the school, as in the nursery, it is the practice and not the theory that is needed; and for the practice the authority of the master suffices. Good morals are much more the result of authority, much more the result of example, of imitation, of impression, than direct inculcation or systematic teaching. The value of direct inculcation and of systematic teaching we by no means disown. But what reason is there that these needful things should not be superadded by those who are specially fitted for the task? If motives are the very life of morality, will those who hold that opinion neglect to supply motives? If so, the fault lies with them. At the very time that the child is receiving from the schoolmaster a lesson of practical morality, he may, under the National system, receive also from the clergyman instructions in the motives which make its observance obligatory.

The tenor of our remarks implies a separation between secular and doctrinal instruction. Such a separation is another principle put forward by the National Association. The separation lies in the very nature of things. The Association does but recognize and adopt it. Subjects that are dissimilar cannot be taught at the same moment. Their dissimilarity necessitates their separate communication. With the same breath no educator ever did teach the Multiplication Table and the Church Catechism. A separation there ever is, a separation there ever must be. The only question is, whether the separation shall be one regulated by law, that is by general consent. Before we advert to that question, let us add a few words on the nature of the

separation. What does the separation really say? Merely that for every subject of instruction there shall be a set time. Is there anything wrong in such a position? Is it wrong to lay it down as a school-regulation, that at nine a. m. writing shall begin; that from half-past nine to ten attention shall be given to arithmetic; that a lesson in practical morals shall be given between the hours of ten and eleven; and that not till eleven the subject of doctrinal and distinctive religion shall be entered upon? Surely regulations of the kind are as harmless as they are necessary. But ought they to receive a legal sanction? Without a legal sanction they cannot become national. And if the nation consents, the sanction is a national sanction. The sanction is co-extensive with the observance, and the observance and sanction are co-extensive with the pecuniary support. An objection is taken: "It is despotic to prohibit the teaching of anything." The teaching of nothing whatever is prohibited. It is a mere question of time, and that question of time is settled not by the will of individuals, but by the national will as expressed by the national legislature. A question of time surely cannot be forced within the domain of the individual conscience. Are there holy hours as well as "holy days"? Must theology be taught when it will and where it will? Is there anything in doctrinal religion which entitles it to refuse submission to such regulations as convenience may suggest and the law of the land enjoin?

The more carefully we study the subject, the more we are acquainted with the objections, the greater the number of diverse plans that come under our notice—in general, the wider our experience, the more fully are we satisfied that this simple and natural expedient of keeping separate the secular element and the religious element is the true solution of the problem which arises from existing diversities in religion, and the more are we convinced that only on that basis can all parties act and a national system of education be obtained. Holding this opinion, we also think that by degrees the real friends of national education will one by one come into this view, and combine in an earnest desire and cordial effort to construct a satisfactory system. Certainly we do not see how a due regard to the rights of conscience can be paid on any system of combined religious and secular instruction. The moment the religious element intervenes, it occasions difficulties. That element cannot intervene without introducing, first, the debated question of religious endowments; secondly, the impure element of Episcopalian pretensions; and, thirdly, the conflicting views of indifferentism and sectarianism. Each of these points brings its own diversities of opinion. Every one of them, therefore, ought to be banished from a subject which requires general consent. But there is one good which is demanded by the national voice and guaranteed by the national legislature,—we mean religious liberty. Religious liberty in regard to national education requires religious equality. Religious equality is unattainable in any system of combined religious and secular education. The moment you allow religion to be taught in the school, the question arises, "Whose religion?" Religion in the abstract is, at any rate practically, a mere form of words. If your religion is taught, mine is thereby discouraged. If all religions are taught, the bulk of men will affirm that pernicious errors are countenanced and propagated. If each man is

allowed to appropriate his rate to schools of his own creed, no provision will be made for the very classes that are most in need of education; those, we mean, and they contain very large numbers, who stand aloof from all our existing religious organizations. Yet in the teaching of all religions, you tax these persons, as well as the unbeliever, for the support of Christianity. There are, moreover, Greeks, Jews, Mohamedans. Especially in our great manufacturing cities, Greeks, Jews, Mohamedans and Hindoos are each a numerous and increasing body. Is their religious liberty to be practically denied? But denied it is if they are compelled to pay for the support and propagation of any or of all of our "denominational" varieties. There is, however, one fact which Dissenters should lay to heart, namely, that the Establishment is in itself and in its operations utterly incompatible with either religious or educational equality. Educational equality, religious equality, can never be enjoyed, if the Establishment,—in other words, if religion,—enters as an element into our system of national education. If religion comes, it inevitably brings the Establishment with it. If the Establishment comes, adieu to equality, adieu to liberty! Our evidence is the history of the Establishment ever since it became an Establishment. What! has the history of the last three hundred years been gone through by Englishmen in vain? Are not Dissenters justified in fearing and suspecting even the apparent liberality of the Establishment? What have Churchmen yielded which they could have retained? What practical recognition of religious equality have they ever given? What ground is there for believing that a system of general education originated by them would be liberally or fairly worked? We wonder that, if their recollections failed them, their instincts did not preserve Dissenters from being caught in the drag-net of the Manchester Episcopal plan. True it is that, by the aid of blandishments which are so easy with and so pleasant from bishops, deans and canons, a fair seeming was at the first given to the proposal which emanated from the Manchester cathedral. And then there was the attraction of novelty. A real Bishop in "the Free-trade Hall"! A Dean becoming the Cobden of education! Canon Stowell converted from a vituperative assailant of national education into a fiery advocate! The Reverend Mr. Osborne, a Methodist preacher, the Canon's man-at-arms, who had solemnly declared the education question "settled," and expressed derisive wonder at the simplicity of the old workers for national education, in that they wished "to re-open the question," appearing foremost in the Episcopal phalanx that came forward to raise an agitation for the very purpose of making the opening wider! These startling facts, which made some men wonder and fear, made others believe and trust. The wonder and the fear remain; the belief and the trust are wearing away. Difficult is it for clergymen to open their lips on a question of social equality, without betraying those inner feelings with which it is incompatible. So long as the Episcopal educationists in Manchester had merely to make their plan palatable to liberal men, they were not without success. But soon came the moment when they had to turn round and defend their scheme against fellow-churchmen. Archdeacon Denison put Mr. Entwistle's churchmanship to the test, and, to save his churchmanship, Mr. Entwistle was obliged to compromise his liberality. "What!" exclaimed the Archdeacon, "forego the teaching of divine truth, renounce the doctrines of our

Church!" "I meant," replied the Chairman of the Local Committee, "I meant nothing of the kind." We cite Mr. Entwistle's repudiation of the charge: "I cannot admit that the exclusion of creeds, catechisms and formularies will exclude the teaching of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, such as, for instance, the doctrines of a future life, of man's fallen nature, of his religious responsibility, of the redemption of the world, and of the revelation of God's will to mankind in the pages of inspired scripture." "My intention was then as it is now, to point out the difference between the inculcation of the doctrines of the Christian faith, such as those I have mentioned, and the instruction of a scholar in a set form of words."* It is, then, only a question of form. This is expressly avowed by the Chairman of the Local Committee. "But it may be said, 'Religious instruction such as you contemplate would necessarily involve catechetical teaching, and therefore you are in fact proposing to effect the very same thing as we now teach by the catechism, only in a different way.' To which I answer, That is indeed my object." That object, then, is, by means of an educational rate, to endow Episcopacy, minus the Episcopal formularies of faith. Whether the omission would be an advantage, let our readers determine for themselves, when they have called to mind the varieties of opinion that prevail in the Establishment, from a Puseyism which prepares the way for Popery, and a German latitudinarianism which is next door to positive unbelief.

Now, let it be observed that it is in schools built out of the resources provided by a public rate that this Episcopalianism is to be taught, and then the religious and educational equality of the "Local Bill" will be fully understood. The proposal is simply that the public in general should bestow on Episcopacy a new endowment. But Mr. Entwistle's proposal is only the thin edge of the wedge. Far is he surpassed by his fellow-churchman, Archdeacon Denison: "I cannot take *one* step in educating a child who has not either received, or is not of such age as to admit of previous teaching in a definite course of education for, holy baptism; and, in the latter case, I should not admit the child into the school until holy baptism had been received."† Call you this religious equality? Is this a recognition or a denial of that educational liberty which the law of the land has gone so far to establish? It sounds like a dictum from some Doctor of the middle ages to say, "You shall not learn to write and cipher until you have received 'holy baptism' according to the Episcopalian ritual." How difficult it is for clergymen to provide a measure of real religious equality, may be learnt from the recently published Charge‡ of the Bishop of Manchester, to which we have before adverted. Let it be premised that his Lordship has in effect conceded the principle of separation on which we have spoken,—a concession, though uttered ungraciously, of high value, as proceeding from such a quarter. His words are these: "While I never would

* "An Apology for a Churchman's Support of the Manchester and Salford Education Bill. By W. Entwistle." Pp. 22, 23. London, 1851.

† "A Reply to the Committee of the Reporters of the Manchester and Salford Education Scheme. By G. A. Denison, M.A., Archdeacon of Taunton." London, 1851.

‡ "A Charge delivered at his Primary Visitation in November, 1851, to the Clergy of the Diocese of Manchester. By James Prince, Lord Bishop of Manchester." London, 1851.

consent to give up the use of the Catechism, Prayer Book, and distinctive teaching of the Church of England in our Church schools, *I would restrict their use to particular periods of the week* (the italics are our own), at which I would permit the child of the Dissenter, *at his own and his parents' peril, to absent himself.*" (P. 26.) The same concession is implied in a passage in which the Bishop disapproves of the provision in the Local Bill which, so far as religion is concerned, merely requires the use of the Bible in the new schools to be erected out of the public rates: "As regards the religious character of schools built wholly out of the rates, I cannot sympathize with those who would make the only test the reading of the Scriptures in them. Experience has taught me that, *in the routine of school teaching, the subjects required are too numerous, even with the lowest classes, to admit of daily teaching any one of them*, unless strictly elementary, or in which manual or mental dexterity and readiness is sought to be acquired. More deep impression will be made, more interest excited, more expectation and desire for instruction created, by a short portion of scripture minutely and in detail investigated, and then reproduced as a whole to the child's mind, in a manner which the effective working of a school *would not admit of daily*, to say nothing of the fear of weakening the interest taken by too frequent recurrence to the subject." (P. 27.) The wisdom and liberality, however, which appear in these words, are painfully qualified by others which ensue. After the incivility to the Dissenter expressed by the Bishop in our first quotation, his Lordship adds, "I would require him (the child of the Dissenter) to *stand* (the Bishop's italics) respectfully at the religious worship of the school, whether he is allowed at his parents' wish to come, and where he is prayed for, if he is unable to join in it. And the like I would require from all Dissenting schools assisted by the rate. No liberty of conscience is thus violated, no evil or dangerous concession made." (P. 26.) Now, we deliberately ask our readers if the person who wrote these words understands the question of religious liberty, and is a safe guardian of its precious rights? The Dissenter's child to *stand* when all the rest kneel—a mark for derision and obloquy! A Dissenter's child to be prayed for! Very likely that he and his may cease to be Dissenters! Painful, very painful recollections connected with our own school education, in part received in a classical school conducted by Churchmen, have been brought up by transcribing these words. We know what it is to be a Dissenter's child (not of the poorest class) among Churchmen's children and under the tuition of Church clergymen. We know how trying it is to the feelings; we know that it is injurious to the morals; we know that it is perilous to conscience. And knowing these things, we are and have for very many years been resolved never to give our consent, humble as it is, to any public system in which religious distinctions are maintained, and in which the big brother of the Establishment may be encouraged or allowed to browbeat the little brother of Dissent.

Minorities would sadly suffer if they were left to the liberality of the "Lord Bishop of Manchester." One proposal of the Local scheme is, that if after due notice the educational want should fail to be supplied by "any denomination," due provision should be made out of the public rate. Schools so built the Bishop declares he would take and govern as Church schools: "Were there such a district, I should unquestionably claim the school built in it, and supported from the

rates, for the Established Church." Now, there could hardly fail to be many such schools required, especially if the Local plan went into general operation. In how many districts—the poorer districts of large towns, agricultural districts, districts thinly peopled—would there be no one denomination strong enough to erect a school-house! Yet the members of the various sects would be compelled to contribute to both the building and the maintenance of the schools. Nevertheless, the schools are to be claimed "for the Established Church." The claim, the inequitable claim thus put forth by the Bishop, has, so far as we know, not been disowned by the Local Committee. Here, then, is boldly announced a fresh invasion of religious equality on the part of our Episcopalian educators. Can our religious liberties be entrusted to such hands? And had we not some grounds for declaring that only by separating the religious element from the secular, can you be assured of a system which in its principles and its working shall guarantee full religious liberty, and honour and secure the rights of conscience?

A national system of popular education must have national support. No other support can supply the requisite resources. How can the requisite national support be best supplied? Let it be given out of the Consolidated Fund; then is the system open to all the evils of political jobbing; and then, too, the pecuniary supply has too much the appearance of charity. The alternative is local taxation. Local and self-imposed taxation is in harmony with our municipal government. If, as it ought to be, the rate is made payable by all householders, the education which it supplies is a right, not a charity. In the main, the people pay for the education of their children. And paying the tax, they will take due care that the tax is not excessive nor augmented by malversation; they will also be vigilant to see that the education for which they pay is a good education; they will require an equivalent for their outlay. These precautions, however, imply that the government of the schools is in the hands of the ratepayers. According to the National system, the government of the schools is in the hands of the ratepayers. But the Local Bill places nearly all power in the hands of the Committee of Council on Education.

We have said that the constructors of the National Bill had also to consider what was attainable. Had they asked themselves what was immediately attainable, they would have shrunk from the task they undertook. Without effort, without sacrifices—perhaps long efforts and many sacrifices—they well knew that nothing good in the way of educational improvement was attainable. As a result of perseverance, they thought much might be obtained. What under these conditions appeared to them attainable, depended very much on the character of existing agencies, and their own power to adapt the new to the old.

The chief school agencies, they found, were intimately connected with the several bodies of religionists. Yet they held it to be their duty to separate religious from secular education. And this was forced upon them, the rather because they saw that the existing system had failed to keep pace with the growing educational wants of the country. That failure, they had valid reasons for believing, was in part owing to the aversion felt by large numbers of the people to the sectarian character of popular schools. To do away that sectarian

character became an object of primary importance. Hence the necessity of the relegation of instruction in doctrinal religion to a portion of the day, when attendance on the part of the scholars should be in the option of the parents. At the same time, it was desirable to conciliate the religious denominations and secure their co-operation in the new arrangements.

Two things were thus required—the favour of the sects and the separation of the secular from the religious instructions. To secure both was as difficult as it was necessary. The plan devised was the simple expedient of undertaking to pay for secular instruction, and for secular instruction only, and to aid the trustees and conductors of existing schools in fixing a time and making arrangements for giving instruction in doctrinal religion. In this way, the Association was committed only to secular instruction, while it looked with favourable regards on religious education. In this way, too, the only change which managers of schools, in order to obtain the rate, would have to make, would be to open such schools for inspection so far as the secular element went, and to transfer the doctrinal instruction they gave to some hour when the secular was not proceeding. In the clauses introduced into the National Bill for these purposes, an option is given to the conductors of "denominational" schools, either to retain the management of the secular department in their own hands, or to consign it to the care of the general Committee to be appointed in each educational district by the ratepayers at large. Instruction in doctrinal religion is thus left where it now is, namely, in the hands of the supporters and conductors of the schools. And the only price, so to term it, which they would have to pay in exchange for the rate, is the adoption of the principle of separation. These, we submit, are fair and easy terms. When they are generally understood, they will, we think, conciliate general favour.

We will mention another social element which the National Association had to take into account. The Dissenters, as a body, were hostile to religious establishments, and professed little liking for religious endowments. Yet in the Dissenters might the Association hope to find its most ready and effectual supporters. In consequence, it was indispensable scrupulously to avoid anything which even looked like a new establishment or a new endowment of religion. Hence the Association may be excused if they have somewhat jealously guarded their secular character from invasion and suspicion.

At the same time, it was their duty not to take any step which should justly offend or alienate members of the Establishment. This evil they attempted to avoid by propounding a system which was perfectly fair to all parties, and could be repudiated by none except such as dissented from their principles or desired special advantages for themselves.

The task which we have thus sketched was one of a very difficult and delicate description. Complete success at the first was not to be expected. But the labour has not been undergone in vain. At any rate, the National Association has succeeded in bringing its principles under the notice of a large portion of the population, and has obtained a considerable degree of public support. It has also had those principles embodied in the shape of an Act of Parliament,—by submitting which to the Legislature it hopes still further to arouse the

mind of the nation on the subject, and make a contribution towards the settlement of a most important question. The provisions of its Bill will be seen in the following "Analysis of the Bill to establish Free Schools in England and Wales, for Secular Instruction, as proposed by the National Public School Association:"

"Clause 1 gives a title to the Bill, as 'The National School Act, 1852.'

"Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive, provide a 'Board of Education' under the Crown, to be composed of three persons, the two junior members being ineligible for Parliament; they are to obtain, from time to time, information of the educational state of this and other countries, and to report annually to Parliament, through the Secretary of State for the Home Department; and they are also to carry the Act into execution. The salaries of the members of the Board are left to be filled in by Parliament.

"Clause 6 prescribes the mode of action to be adopted by the Board. They or their Inspectors are to visit such places as shall by them be deemed necessary, or where invited by memorial from a majority of the ratepayers to constitute 'School Districts,' which may be composed of a city, borough, parish, or any other existing boundary, or a part of, or a combination of, the same; the creation of every such district to be advertised in the *London Gazette.* But a majority of the ratepayers of any such district memorializing against it, will prevent the Act from taking effect for two years after any such memorial.

"Clauses 7 and 8 provide for the election of a School Committee out of the ratepayers of each district, to be chosen after the manner of the Poor-law Guardians, except that every ratepayer will have a vote, and no ratepayer more than one vote; one half of the Committee to retire each year, eligible, however, to re-election. Clause 9 makes the Committee a corporation capable of acquiring and holding property.

"Clauses 10, 11 and 12 give the Committee power to hire or purchase existing school-rooms, reserving the right of existing trustees to their use for purposes of religious instruction, when not in use for secular instruction under the Act,—power to purchase land, and to erect new school-rooms, teachers' dwellings, &c., to be paid for in one year, or spread over twenty years.

"Clause 13 gives power to appoint a Treasurer and Secretary.

"Clauses 14 and 15 provide for the establishment of four classes of schools, viz., Infant, Day, Evening and Industrial Schools, with right of free admission to all, under certain restrictions to ensure order and system. Thus in cases of crime and gross insubordination, the Committee have power to refuse admission, and admission to the Industrial Schools is to be by order of a magistrate.

"Clause 16 enacts that neither doctrinal religion, nor anything in favour of or opposed to the peculiar tenets of any sect of Christians, shall be taught or enforced in any of the schools, and it gives a power of appeal against any breach of this rule.

"Clauses 17 and 18 give power to appoint and remove masters and teachers, to select school books, and to prescribe courses of instruction; to appoint visitors to communicate with apathetic parents, so as to induce a general compliance with the system.

"Clauses 19, 20 and 21 provide for the sustentation of existing schools under their present managers, on condition of their conforming to the terms of the Act with regard to doctrinal religion, so that dissentients from their creed may attend the schools without violation of conscience.

"Clause 22 excludes ministers of religion from salaried offices.

"Clauses 23 and 24 provide for raising school-rates, after the manner of poor-rates, for the support of the schools to be set up or maintained, and with like powers of appeal.

"Clauses 25 and 26 provide for the annual publication of accounts, and for reports to the Board of Education, by district school committees and trustees in union.

"Clauses 27 and 28 provide for the appointment of honorary examiners,

who, in cŏnjunction with inspectors appointed by the Board of Education, are to hold sittings in each county, for the examination of masters and teachers, to whom they are to give or refuse certificates.

"Clauses 29 and 30 enact that the Board shall establish and support normal schools for the training of teachers, such schools being subject to the same rules with regard to the teaching of doctrinal religion as the day schools; and school committees are to have power to assist meritorious pupils in their expenses at the normal schools, and to present them from their own districts.

"Clauses 31 and 32 provide for the appointment of inspectors by the Board of Education, whose expenses, together with those of the honorary examiners and of the normal schools, are to be paid out of the Consolidated Fund.

"Clause 33 provides that the Act may be amended this session."

In the preceding exposition we have confined our observations to the leading features of the National measure, and the contrast in which they stand to the plan put forth by the Committee for the establishment of a system limited to Manchester and Salford. While we have of necessity avoided details, the reader may rest assured that in our remarks, taken in connection with the Analysis here given, he has before him every important principle and regulation that has received the sanction of the National Association. It may, however, be desirable to add, that the National Bill has been drawn in such a manner as to serve the purposes of a local measure, while gradually it would become universal.

The chief evidence of the success which has attended the operations of the Association, has been the appearance in the field of a competitor for public favour in the Society formed for the purpose of "promoting Education in the Municipal Boroughs of Manchester and Salford." Of the Bill which that Society has laid before Parliament, much has been already said. Should it pass into a law, its chief effect would be to transfer to the ratepayers the support of schools now maintained by opulent individuals and sectarian organizations. As a means of setting before our readers a summary of the objections which we know to be entertained to the Local Bill by a large and influential number of the inhabitants of Manchester and Salford, we subjoin the following Protest, which we leave in the form of a Memorial, in which it was originally drawn up:

"1st. Because the said Bill will violate the conscientious convictions of a large body of the ratepayers, who object to be taxed for the support of religious teaching, and particularly for the teaching of opposite, and in their view, erroneous religious opinions; the provision enabling any ratepayer to appropriate his rate to any particular school, or class of schools, being illusory, inasmuch as any surplus will be applied as though no such appropriation had been made, and any deficiency will be made up out of the general rate, as the amount of payment is fixed at a certain sum per scholar.

"2nd. Because the Bill proposes to lay a tax on the whole community, whilst the conditions of union are such as will exclude many ratepayers from benefit, whose conscientious convictions are at variance with such conditions.

"3rd. Because the Bill assumes that secular and religious instruction must be combined, and sanctions the teaching of various and opposite theological opinions at the expense of the ratepayers; thereby, in the opinion of your Memorialists, ignoring special religious truth, and substituting a latitudinarianism which your Memorialists believe to be pregnant with danger to the interests of religion.

"4th. Because the said Bill tends to perpetuate the evils of sectarianism, by discouraging the association, in the same schools, of children whose parents belong to different religious denominations.

"5th. Because the said Bill lays a tax for a *local* object, but gives the power of management almost entirely to a *central* authority; and because it violates the spirit of the Municipal Corporation Act, by rendering the Municipal Council subservient, in matters purely local, to the Committee of Privy Council.

"6th. Because the said Bill does not provide Industrial Schools for that class of the community which has no means of obtaining a livelihood, except by begging and crime; makes no provision for children under four years of age, and provides only conditionally for help to Evening Schools.

"7th. Because the mode by which it is proposed to erect new schools is a premium upon sectarianism; and because the erecting of such schools by private persons, as provided by the Bill, will place all such schools in the hands of the richest sects, to the exclusion of those sects whose poverty deprives them of the power to erect schools.

"8th. Because the provision made by the said Bill for exempting children from doctrinal teaching objectionable to their parents is so imperfect, that it would virtually exclude many from the only schools which might be within accessible distance.

"9th. Because, by proposing a pecuniary qualification beyond that of paying rates for members of Committees, many persons may be excluded who are morally and intellectually qualified for the office.

"10th. Because the operation of the Bill is primarily limited to such schools as are permitted, or permissible, to participate in the Parliamentary grant under the Minutes of Privy Council; whereas the said Minutes are not embodied, or constitutionally recognized, in any Act of Parliament; and because the restrictions imposed in cases where such limitation does not obtain, will altogether exclude from benefit some schools which are quite as efficient for secular instruction as are those admitted.

"11th. Because the said Bill, while it lays an equal rate upon all, does, by its terms, set up an inequality of support for schools in union; paying the same amount to schools which receive aid out of the Parliamentary grants, as to those which do not, to the great disadvantage of many schools quite as efficient for secular instruction as those which will enjoy the advantages of both means of support.

"12th. Because there is no evidence to shew that the said Bill is acceptable to the ratepayers of Manchester and Salford, as it has never been adopted by any open public meeting within the said boroughs; whilst the principles of your Memorialists have been sanctioned by large majorities in open meetings, and by a town's meeting called by the Worshipful the Mayor of Manchester, and by a petition, bearing the signatures of above 60,000 inhabitants of Manchester and Salford and their vicinities."

The preceding essay was written before the announcement respecting national education made by the Prime Minister at the end of his exposition of the new Reform Bill. That announcement was to the effect that the Government ere long would take up and settle the question. In that announcement the friends of the National Association find great satisfaction and a high reward. Earnestly do they hope that a liberal and generally satisfactory measure may be passed. To secure so desirable a result, they will continue to labour diligently. How far the principles which they have espoused may be adopted by the Legislature, it is at present impossible to say and useless to conjecture. But, confident of the final triumph of truth, they await the issue in mingled joy, hope and faith.*

---

* Copies of the National Bill and explanatory papers may be had by application to the Secretary, Mr. R. W. Smiles, 28, Cross Street, Manchester.

THOM ON THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.*

A work not merely written in an epistolary form, but being a *bonâ-fide* collection of letters occasioned by the circumstances of the persons to whom they were written,—intended to remove existing perplexities, to deal with temporary disorder, to correct erroneous impressions, or to confirm earlier and more correct convictions,—might be, and no doubt in the case of such an enlightened and fervent mind as that of the apostle Paul *was*, perfectly intelligible in all its parts to those for whose use its several Epistles were written. But if contemporary history do not record the notions and customs to which the Epistle, often with brevity, has referred in the tone of blame or approval, and if tradition has dropped from its imperfect transmission all mention of those early customs and errors and fancies, upon which the letter touches, then, as time advances, and oblivion steals over the past, the Epistle will naturally become obscure; terms used in it will be unintelligible, as we can have no knowledge of things or the state of things to which they belong; and the difficulty or impossibility of explaining them will come out more fully as successive interpreters set themselves to expound what in its sense is utterly lost. All, in such cases, must be mere conjecture. It may be ingenious; it may catch some fancied resemblance in later times, and so give a plausible meaning to obsolete terms; but the attempt to revive what is discoverable by no relic of its former self is as vain an attempt as to "call spirits from the vasty deep."

But while an obscurity which can never be removed hangs over some passages of the letters of the apostle Paul; while in them there are names of offices to which nothing corresponding survived in the earlier ages after his time; while there are accounts of practices on which the synagogue and the heathen temples and oracles throw no light, to which if at later times anything has occurred accidentally resembling them, it would most probably be expressed in totally different terms,—we cannot too gratefully receive the contribution to the store of Christian literature which these Epistles furnish: and so rich is this, in all the vital and essential parts of the gospel, and of the spirit of its holy author, that no portion of sacred writ is more truly valuable than these Pauline Epistles; and even in the midst of those impenetrable obscurities which we lament, some bright eternal thought or principle almost always occurs to calm disorderly excitement, applicable to any disorder or extravagance that may in any age disturb the peace of the Christian community, or mar the usefulness of its members.

Writing from the treasures of a mind filled with all that was interesting in Jewish history, and trained to Jewish modes of reasoning and quotation by the associations of his early education, and his zealous career as a Pharisee in the commencement of his active life, he made all subservient, after his conversion, to his determination not to know anything but Jesus Christ and him crucified; and none of the less gifted apostles so completely emancipated themselves from the

* St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians: an Attempt to convey their Spirit and Significance. By John Hamilton Thom.

thraldom of Jewish prejudices as did the apostle of the Gentiles. So fully understanding, and so clearly representing, the principles of the gospel of Christ, and so forcibly exhibiting its practical obligations, its mental and spiritual blessings, our confidence in his guidance is strengthened rather than weakened in the corroboration of the authenticity of the writings as his, that we must acknowledge here and there the traces of his former self: that we see a few instances of reference, the pertinency of which we cannot discern; of reasoning, the conclusiveness of which is not entirely satisfactory; or even of opinions which take a tinge from the strong associations of his early life. Were we the advocates of the absurd notion of plenary inspiration, of the possibility of the absolute and faultless perfection of any writings of any man, in any age, we must conceal these concessions. Nothing but strong prejudice could prevent our discovering them; and when discovered, nothing but insincerity, or a timid or worldly policy, could suggest that they ought not to be honestly stated. Happily, we know that they are such as not to invalidate the testimony nor the substantial authority of this most faithful, most candid, most zealous and most thoroughly instructed follower and apostle of Christ.

The work which has elicited these introductory remarks is, and is not in the ordinary sense and form, a commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians. It is a series of explanatory discourses delivered to the author's congregation about nine years ago; and highly favoured is that Christian society which has enjoyed the advantage of hearing such productions from the pulpit.

In its present state, a portion of the Epistle—one or more chapters—is printed in full, and followed by a generally lucid explanation; and then the spirit pervading the whole passage is exhibited in a deep tone of Christian feeling, and with a beautiful and, according to our judgment, correct appreciation of the mind and heart of this noble apostle, as poured out in the service of his Master in these two Epistles. In the delineation of "Charity," it strikes us that Mr. Thom dwells more upon the *sentiment*, while the apostle is ever prominently putting forth its *fruits*. In his description, *tenderness* is prevalent; in the apostle's discourse, *activity*. In him, it is *indwelling;* in the apostle, *outpouring*. In him, it is an all-embracing quality of the mind; in the apostle, it is the all-serving of a devoted life. But we cannot withhold his beautiful description of "Charity:"

"This 'Charity' is a sentiment, or pervading tendency of the character, rather than a particular affection. It is the constant temper of the heart—not the warmth of individual attachments. It acts universally, and before personal affections have time, or opportunity, to be formed. It does not depend on association, or local connections, or the relations of mutual interest, which create so many of the strongest and most faithful bonds of earthly fellowship. It exists independently within the heart, and is not excited into life, as the passions are, by the attractions and solicitations of its objects. It acts at all times, and amid the most novel or the most revolting circumstances—as truly as amid scenes most familiar, and with beings most endeared. It is *the sympathy* of the spirit with God, with Humanity, and with Nature. It is the quick and living sentiment to which *the Divine* in Life is never long obscured—which keeps the spiritual ear open to the still small voice, and the heart, undimmed by self-seeking or the soiling breath of sensual desire, as a pure mirror to receive the images of Grace and Truth, from the Spirit of

Holiness and Love that dwells in all things. It is that spirit which, without effort, and by an unbidden impulse, finds itself in gentle communication with every condition of Humanity,—to which no joy of another's heart is unnoticed—no grief of another's heart indifferent;—which feels an involuntary thankfulness rising up to God for every scene of human happiness it is permitted to witness—for every evidence that the world is not so wretched as we sometimes deem it to be—for the cheerful voices of labour—for the song that shows the still light and uncrushed heart of tasked poverty, and for the laughter of children in dismal and neglected streets. It is the spirit that feels the bond of a common nature with all sentient things,—and that, in fact, has acknowledged that bond in the most emphatic way, by giving to a sympathy with the animal creation the remarkable name of *humanity*. It is a spirit which, when not a natural gift from God, it is the last and most perfect result of the discipline of life, and of the religious care of the character, to frame within the heart; for it is not an affection that can be excited by its objects and nurtured by outward warmth, but the very temper and spirit of the soul itself—the mild and reconciling eye of meekness and sympathy that looks with one love on all things. It is the uniting, reconciling, atoning Power of the moral and spiritual Universe.—Intellect may give keenness of discernment. Love alone gives largeness to the whole Nature, some share in the comprehensiveness of God."—Pp. 189—191.

With St. Paul's Epistles in our hands, it may surprise us that we have almost all of us in early life entertained enchanting views of the simplicity, pureness, zeal, benevolence and general Christian excellence of the members of the primitive church. While those Epistles are written, to the Romans, to confute existing errors—to the Corinthians, to correct disorderly and even immoral conduct and ostentatious pretensions—to the Galatians, to annihilate the folly and remove the danger of mixing Jewish ceremonies with the spiritual doctrine of Christ—to the Thessalonians, to shew that they must forsake vices still prevalent amongst them, and to warn them not to neglect the duties of this life, in the fanatical anticipation of an early entrance into another state of existence—in the later Epistle to them he regrets that his own description had been mistaken or perverted so as to lead to the neglect of their common duty—and his letters to Timothy were to warn the church against ambitious and troublesome leaders, unworthy of their position, and to point out the duties which the members were too apt to neglect;—we ask ourselves how it is that, with all these guides to a more correct judgment, the Christian mind has ever resorted to this early church as the model of perfection in doctrine, in practice and in spirit? And we trace that we are led by the hopeful spirit of the apostle, who saw in the few, absorbed by the divine spirit of Christ, a walk and conversation becoming the gospel; and contemplated in the partial effects of the new faith what would, in circumstances more favourable, constitute its universal character; and he speaks of this as a thing not to be, but as generally prevailing wherever the faith has taken possession of the human heart. Mr. Thom has stated this erroneous and prevailing impression of the real state of the primitive church in the following passage:

"And we are especially liable, from feelings akin to veneration, to misconceive the actual condition of the Early Churches. In the absence of distinct historical knowledge, which indeed does not exist, and must be collected from hints and incidental notices, a religious sentiment of what would be *natural* to such a season, of what would harmonize with our own ideal conceptions of

the men and the manners that ought to have been produced by such a rending of the Heavens, and such an outpouring of divine influences from God, covers with a solemn haze that holy Time, and peoples it with the mystic forms of spiritual and unearthly men,—just as Palestine itself, to many a mind, appears not to have belonged to this common earth, but to be a Shadow Land where spirits walked, and the Angel's wing might be daily seen amid the haunts of men. Our religious feeling of the sacredness and elevation of heart that must *needs* characterize Apostolic men, and of the lofty element of piety and love, above the agitation and disturbance of the lower passions and meaner thwartings of Life, in which we suppose them to have habitually breathed,—is transferred also to the Apostolic Churches;—and notwithstanding very significant hints to the contrary, the historic picture of strife and spiritual pretension—alas! of common humanity—is too dim to rob us of the fairer vision of simplicity, self-surrender, heavenly-mindedness, and superiority to all minor things, which we naturally ascribe to the Primitive Christianity. I know nothing more painful than to have one's heart disenchanted of such a picture; and there is no task one less willingly undertakes, than to make such a benignant vision fade away, whilst the cold, hard features of the Reality are gradually exposed. A man who reveres his nature, and believes that all that was ever imaged of its Purity and Love, might well be nothing short of true, will not exhibit an inhuman eagerness to dissolve any fair and blessed belief in a realized sacredness and peace, which though it belongs *to the Past*, and claims no place *in the Present*, still shows, by the facility with which it is received, the Faith of the common heart in the divine affections of humanity."—Pp. 203, 204.

In his first lecture he gives a representation of the state of Corinth, and the mixed population assembled in that newly rebuilt city, which became the Venice of the old world. He shews how the gathered opinions, associations, religions and philosophies, would unavoidably influence the conceptions of any converts to Christianity, and their conduct and dispositions in their communion with each other; that the speculative Jew of Alexandria would seize Christianity "as a means of reconciling his old faith with his later and foreign speculations;" the Palestinian Jew would receive the gospel "only as the long-expected consummation of Judaism;" and the Gentiles would, from their philosophic and speculative bent of mind, be ready to acquiesce in any new theory divulged; but "with such minds the difficulty would be to obtain a reception of the new religion, not as a philosophy, but as *a life*." (P. 9.)

In the several succeeding sections he exhibits, with the faithfulness, but also with the honesty of a true conservative spirit, the pretensions, the disagreements, the party spirit, the disputes, and, in one melancholy case, the moral disorder, which would unavoidably spring from Christianity received in such minds; and he shews how admirably the apostle Paul has conducted his reproof and his instruction in such a perplexing and disheartening state of a church which he himself had formed. After a striking description of "the practical power and vital energy" of Christianity, he proceeds:

"But there have always been two classes of men who have not been contented with the moral power of God's Christ, as the medium of divine attraction and the instrument of salvation. These are,—first, the superstitious, whose states of soul are excited only by states of sense, and who cannot conceive the Divine Spirit communicating itself to man except through the observances with which in their own case they have exclusively associated the operations of His grace;—and, secondly, that class of minds in whom the

speculative is the predominating element, and who, from some cold bias, or stern enthusiasm, of the speculative reason, connect the saving agencies of God, not with the spiritual affections of the believer's heart, but with the theological system that recommends itself to his states of thought. The Roman Catholic, and the members of the Anglican Church, the sacerdotal part of the Church of England, are, amongst us, the representatives of the superstitious Christian—of the Jewish Christians of the days of St. Paul. They say that a soul cannot be led into communion with God through the love of Christ alone. They say that though Christ is the only mediator, or means of attraction, between man and God, yet that there is a necessity for other mediators between man and Christ,—and that there is no true sympathy with Jesus, except in those who have received the rite of baptism from a consecrated Priest in the direct line of the Apostolical succession, and who have partaken of the Lord's Supper from legitimate hands. These are the counterparts of those Corinthian opponents of St. Paul, the Jewish Christians, who maintained that Christ drew to God only the circumcised, and that the Holy Spirit disregarded the state of the affections and their moral oneness with Jesus, unless they were found keeping the Jewish law. The dogmatical Christians of this day, under all their varieties, are the counterparts of the speculative Christianity that prevailed among the Gentile converts of Corinth. They deny that Christ touches a soul with the spirit of God through the power of his character, and the overflowing fulness of that spirit in himself. They deny this direct spiritual attraction. They affirm that Christ touches a soul with the love of God, and sanctifies it by a divine affection, only when it adopts certain views of the metaphysical essence of the Deity—only when it receives a certain theory of the nature of Evil, and of God's connexion with it, and, in the spirit of the Gnostic Emanations, breaks the unity of God into three personalities,—the Father absolute and self-existent,—the Son, the first Emanation, eternally proceeding from the Father,—and the Holy Spirit, the second Emanation, eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son."—Pp. 25, 26.

And he adds, with great truth,

"St. Paul, to avoid divisions on merely intellectual topics, declared, 'I will know nothing, as affecting Christians, but the moral spirit that was in the life and death of Christ.' And the Preachers of this day, in direct opposition, declare that, '*only* to know this is to know *nothing*;' for that '*Christ crucified*' is only *one* part of a vast system,—which system arose in this way:—that there is an Evil Being in eternal conflict with God, a Dualism in the universe; that this Evil Being tempted Adam to sin; that this sin impregnated the whole of his race successively with the spirit of the Evil One, so that the Devil and not God is henceforth the Father of their moral natures; that God was willing to regenerate fallen man with a new spirit from Himself, and to expel the evil one, but that he *could* not do so in consistency with his Attributes, for his Authority had its claims as well as his Mercy, until some expiation had been offered to him, commensurate with the indignity he had suffered in the rebellion of his children; that to meet this moral necessity of God's nature, there were in his essence three Infinite Persons, and that one of these Persons was willing to suffer in the place of men; that an infinite indemnity being thus provided for the immeasurable insult of sin, the Austerity of God no longer restrained his Love, and his sanctifying Spirit might now operate upon those who, by thankfully recognising the substituted expiation, paid this tribute to his violated Authority."—Pp. 34, 35.

The following is an important description of St. Paul's division of the faculties of man:

"St. Paul points at the existence of a three-fold nature in man; one of which is peculiarly the religious faculty,—whilst the others, whenever they

presume to impress themselves on Christianity, and to mould it after their own tendencies, become the sources of divisions, intolerance, bigotry, mere human partizanship, and all the rest of the practical religious evils. In a broad and general way we may comprehend this triple nature under the heads of the Sensual or carnal man,—the Intellectual or animal man,—and the Religious or spiritual man. Every man is a compound of these three, and the moral question is, Which predominates and subordinates the rest? There is order in the individual mind, and peace in the Church, only when the spiritual faculty, the recognised oracle and vicegerent of God, is the essential leader,—and when the dictates of speculation or corporeal feeling, however innocent or serviceable, as accessaries, to the Individual, are never suffered to become *leading* principles in the mind, or to lay *foundations* in the Church. In our English translation these three elements in man are distinguished, as the carnal man, the natural man, and the spiritual man. It may perhaps place many in a position to form an independent judgment as to what St. Paul understood by this so-called *natural* man, to mention that it is the same conception, and the same word, as the *Psyche* of the Greeks. From the utterly indefensible and misleading use which polemics make of the expression, 'natural man,' in our translation, no one could suppose that it related to those parts of Man—the passions, loves, thoughts, and sensibilities of the earthly mind—which correspond with this impersonation of Mythology. By confounding the 'natural man' with the 'carnal man,' and by representing that the 'spiritual man' is not an original element in our nature, but a distinct endowment, like a new sense, of supernatural Grace acting arbitrarily, our orthodox theologians have removed St. Paul's conceptions of Man and Christianity, and substituted their own System."—Pp. 46, 47.

We cannot resist adding the following passage:

"How often are Unitarians met with that question, *What is* Unitarianism—*what is* your Religion? And the question always means this:—'What are your special reliances, that you have secured for yourselves a protection against God?' If you say, 'Christianity has taught you to have faith in the divine Love, and to seek immediate communion with the Father of the soul,—and that the Son of God has shown us how to prepare the heart for some inward union with God's spirit,'—you are thought to say a thing utterly vague, indefinite, shadowy,—in fact, to have no certain grounds of safety, no definite terms on the observance of which you can hold God bound to save you. For this is what is chiefly sought for in religion—this is the refined selfishness of spiritual anxiety;—'How can I get assured of my safety,—how can I hold God pledged to me?—Let me know what I am to believe in as the terms of salvation,—what are the outward observances that God has appointed as the conditions of final Mercy?'—and so vanish, in this legal and covenanting temper, all the filial trusts of a religious mind—the worship of the Father in the spirit of a child's faith and reality. There never was a time, since the Reformers, with a dim consciousness of spiritual freedom, made their ineffectual protest, when Christianity was so prominently an ecclesiastical, and so little a spiritual interest. On all sides the machinery is thrust upon you, as if it was the inward and essential life. Not the soul's communion with God, but the agency of a Church,—not practical discipleship to the Lord Jesus, the baptism of the affections into the spirit of his life and death, but the efficacy of the sacraments,—not faith in God, but belief in doctrines,—not reliance on divine Beings, but confidence in dead rites and propositions:—these are the essentials of which we hear so much,—the symbols everything—the Realities forgotten. Even the dying wretch, on whose crimes man will have no mercy, is taught to lay hold on the symbol, and, naming the name of Christ, to exult in his safety. The man who has spent his life without God in the world, will yet close it with some feeling of protection if he has partaken of the Sacrament on his dying bed;—the most worldly deem there is

some security in avowing an attachment to the Bible,—and the Ministers of the Gospel of repentance and newness of life not only assume, but, so little are they aware of the degradation, vindicate their exclusive claims to the character of spiritual Magicians."—Pp. 63, 64.

The inestimable value of St. Paul's writings is powerfully set forth in this passage:

"When we consider that the Authenticity of these Epistles of St. Paul has never been disputed by any party, we cannot conceive that anything more is wanting to the substantial validity of the external evidences of Christianity, —nor how, amidst such vivid pictures of its actual workings, the reality of that new Influence introduced from on high into the affairs of men, can in its essential character be open to question, or received by so many earnest minds with vague and doubting Faith. The delineation of Christ's mind can be collected only from the Gospels; but as evidences of the Reality of *some* higher influence, introduced by God through the person of Christ into the common heart of the World, the Epistles afford the ground on which the Argument can decisively be conducted."—P. 114.

Commenting on the chapter in which the institution of the Lord's Supper is mentioned, Mr. Thom says, "It is not necessary to suppose that St. Paul had a separate revelation of the particulars of this memorial service, nor indeed will the words of the original naturally bear this construction." That there would be no need of a revelation of the particulars in detail, is a sufficient reason for not believing that he had a special revelation; for he most probably had observed and learnt these at Jerusalem amongst the apostles. But on the fact of this ordinance being a perpetual memorial, and not confined to those personally acquainted with Jesus, the apostle's authority is strengthened by his being able to declare to Gentile churches, 'I have received this from the Lord himself.' He has more than once disclaimed his receiving the gospel at second-hand, or learning its spirit from the first apostles; and he is really an apostle because he had conversed with his risen Master, and had been instructed and *sent* by him. This view removes the doubt of the custom being a mere token of personal affection and respect, and gives greater, and we think not imaginary, force to the passage in which Mr. Thom expresses his sense of the obligation and importance of this ordinance.

"One point this whole passage does determine,—namely, that this Memorial Service was not confined to those who witnessed it, and that it had a fitness and application out of Judea, and beyond the circle of the first Disciples. It is the only symbolic Service, in its character of a Church, which Christianity possesses; and one sometimes wonders that those who are ready to complain of the bareness of our worship, coldly hold themselves apart from the breathing spirit of this Memorial Act. And how full of significance, of deep life, are those spiritual symbols! To show forth the Lord's death until he come! Can we pass a day, righteously, mercifully, meekly, resignedly, without the spirit of the Lord's Death? Are we sure that it might not be good to watch with him one hour, as in a spiritual Gethsemane, before, in the world, we incur the risk of deserting him at the Cross? Might it not be well to bear about with us the Dying of the Lord Jesus, that the Life also of the Lord Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh?"—Pp. 157, 158.

In his remarks upon the gift of tongues, upon speaking in unknown tongues, and upon the terms used to describe the unprofitableness and confusion of this obscure practice, he confirms his own views by

quotations from Neander. Whether they will or will not generally approve themselves to critics, this is clear, that there is so much difficulty and uncertainty hanging over this subject, that no rational countenance can be given by any of the details to the fanatical pretensions which the unhappy Irving set up, and on which his followers now strangely act.

In the absence of all clear and satisfactory documents to furnish a key to the perplexities in the sublime chapter of the apostle upon the resurrection of the dead, Mr. Thom supposes that St. Paul enters into this elaborate exposition of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, not regarding any of the Christian community as doubting it, but knowing that they were distressed through their Messianic notion of the second coming of Christ; as this was connected with the idea that all the saints who were alive would reign with him, while those who had died previously to his coming would be deprived of that honour. Such a supposition explains some of the obscurities in that chapter, but it leaves some great difficulties as insurmountable as ever. We present the author's view of the apostle's argument in its more universal relations, as an excellent summary of its most profitable contents.

"1. There was no doubt (in the Corinthian Church) entertained of the resurrection of Christ. And if one resurrection was admitted, why not a universal resurrection? One established case destroys the theoretical improbability. Either a universal resurrection was possible and credible, or Christ was not risen at all. Either the inductive fact must be denied, or the induction from it must be admitted.

"2. St. Paul employs the admitted fact of the resurrection of Christ, as a more *direct* argument for the resurrection of all mankind, as not only demonstrative of its *possibility*, but as a pledge and pattern of a universal destiny.

"3. St. Paul argues for the resurrection of all mankind, from the moral consequences that would follow from the denial of that doctrine.

"4. St. Paul meets the objection which a sceptical materialism would most obviously suggest to the doctrine of a resurrection." This illustration of the apostle is very beautifully expanded.

"5. Lastly, St. Paul explains the mystery of the change passed upon us by death. We die, because flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; and we must all be *changed*, in order that this corruptible may put on incorruption, and this mortal may put on immortality."

The apostle's state of mind upon receiving the report of the effect of the former Epistle, fills him with joy and gratitude, the expression of which is well brought out; and some valuable remarks upon intercessory prayer occur, illustrating the apostle's gratitude for the prayers of the Corinthian church in his behalf.

But we must now briefly catalogue the topics on which the reader will find in the book happy thoughts, clear illustrations, ingenious expositions, and a rich vein of practical instruction. On all these topics as they severally present themselves in this later Epistle, Mr. Thom has strikingly exhibited the wealth and purity and disinterestedness and bold integrity of the apostle's mind and heart. They are thus miscellaneously stated:—The sufferings of Christ converted by speculative orthodoxy into vicarious atonement—Two redemptions—The *necessity* laid upon St. Paul—All self-glorying in relation to Christianity impossible—Love of popularity—Truth—A revelation

from God—Image of God in Christ—Sin-offerings—Sympathy kept in subordination to truth—How men may corrupt others besides by bad example—The spiritual philosophy of contrition—Different kinds of sorrow—A great mind applied to determine *permanent principles*—The charity of the poor—Man bedims the impartiality of God—How to equalize God's gifts—The law of love the same as the law of labour—The heart the counsellor to charity—The apostle's self-defence—His boast of his degrading and cruel sufferings—Greatness of mind shewn in violating conventional moralities—The apostolic visions and revelations.

It is a slight diminution of the almost unqualified praise we have felt in justice compelled to bestow upon this volume, that we are dissatisfied with some of the translations which the author has substituted; and in a few cases we think that those in the Common Version are more correct, and generally as well or better suited to the course of the author's remarks upon the passages themselves.

Such a work as this is of great value as an exhibition of the solid and important information conveyed in the holy apostle's Epistles to the Christian world at large, and in every generation, though they were written for the special use of the persons to whom they were addressed. And we earnestly hope that, by a wide circulation, it will bring many who have been perplexed by the difficulties preventing the easy understanding of some occasional expressions and passages, into a more intimate acquaintance with, and a higher estimation of, the divine spirit of faith and love and practical wisdom which prompted the apostle Paul in all he did and in all he wrote.

OWENS COLLEGE, MANCHESTER.*

After a considerable delay, the best justification of which is to be found in the choice of Professors ultimately made by the Trustees, and one false step on their part, which we trust they will not repeat, Owens College is at length organized and in operation. It is an event of great interest, as the renewal of an attempt, hitherto not permanently successful, to establish a School of University education, equally unconnected with the Established Church and any sectarian body, in a locality devoted to Commerce and Manufactures. Opinions have varied greatly as to the causes of previous failure, which some have attributed to the caprice which characterizes voluntary effort; others, to the unpopularity of certain religious opinions; and others, to the indifference which men who have themselves risen to wealth without partaking of a higher education are supposed to feel towards literature and science. The munificent foundation of Mr. Owens has secured his College from the risk of failure from the first of these causes; if its position, standing

* Introductory Lectures on the Opening of Owens College, Manchester. 8vo. Pp. 136. Manchester, 1852.†

† This is the date of the title-page, and it is nowhere noticed that the opening of the College and the delivery of the Lectures took place in 1851. This may hereafter mislead. Each Lecture should have had its own date.

apart from all religious denominations, deprives it of the zealous support of religious partizans, it should also neutralize their hostility. The question to be tried, therefore, in this experiment is, whether a taste for the higher branches of philosophy, literature and science can be infused into a busy industrial community, like that of Manchester and its neighbourhood.

There can be no doubt that in a district so thickly covered with cotton-mills and print-works, a market will always exist for that species of scientific knowledge which produces an immediate return in hard cash. Mr. Owens wisely left this kind of knowledge to be called into existence by the ordinary operation of supply and demand, and directed his endeavours to the fostering of those studies which were in danger of languishing without direct patronage. His object was to found a University, not a College of Engineering, or Chemistry, or Practical Agriculture. The accomplished Principal, Mr. Scott, therefore, has done wisely in his Inaugural Discourse, not to attempt to bespeak the favour of his audience, by telling them, what they knew far better than himself, that knowledge in its practical applications is power and wealth. He takes much higher ground, contending that, whether we regard University education historically, or according to its ideal conception, its true object is to teach men the full exercise of their mental faculties, and an application of them to high and worthy objects.

"I am stimulated," he says, "to this undertaking by contemplating the prodigious antagonist forces, with which the serene and ideal attractions of the intellectual life have to struggle in this metropolis of the world's industrial activity; forces, some of them essentially hostile, destined, we trust, to be weakened or crushed in the conflict, but for the most part intrinsically noble or needful, and capable, therefore, of being harmonised with the influences which we have now especially to advocate, and of co-operating with them in a friendly opposition and healthful counterpoise, like that which maintains order among the powers of the material world, and which a due social organization strives to resemble."—P. 2.

Mr. Scott is so far from seeking to conciliate the favour of practical men towards education of that higher order for which he pleads, by shewing its immediately tangible or saleable utility, that he admits the absence of such qualities to be the usual characteristics of the researches and contemplations of profound and speculative minds. And yet, if we trace back the history of knowledge, we shall find that truths which guide the most mechanical practice had their origin in inquiries and speculations to which their authors were led by no view of utility or profit, but simply by the impulse of genius and the abstract love of knowledge.

"The practical results of great discoveries of truth are, to a great extent, necessarily unforeseen, their very direction unthought of, not only during the investigation, but even after the discovery is made, and by the discoverer himself. They cannot constitute his guidance or his inducement. It is truth for her own sake he has sought. Men gather fruit from his knowledge, because truth is prolific. But the progressive applications of a great discovery during centuries, or to the end of time, are an incomplete measure of the pregnancy of the original truth, which, by its principle of active life, is greater and more precious than all of them. We have here, then, a sphere of mental activity, which is, indeed, found to be fertile in most important uses, while these uses cannot be anticipated during the process, or proposed as its object.

If far the larger share of such fruits are not directly or distinctly contemplated by the inquirer himself, how much less will the mass of mankind associate them with his abstruse studies? Kepler may have been aware that an improved knowledge of the planetary motions must improve navigation; he may even have definitely contemplated the lunar method of finding longitude as a result of his improvement of the lunar theory; but were merchants or seamen likely to consider their affairs as influenced by his enormous and apparently abstract calculations? Had the passion with which he devoted himself to ascertain the law of proportion between the distances of the planetary orbits from the sun, and the periods of their revolutions, anything to do, according to the apprehension of his cotemporaries, with future fleets bringing home the materials of English manufactures, and the produce and manufactures of lands innumerable, for English use? And yet, in the commerce of all our ports is Kepler living, thinking, working, even now, daily and hourly, with a ubiquity and effect against which no services of individuals directly engaged in it are for a moment to be measured; discharging functions for which the payment of annual thousands in perpetuity would be a scanty recompence. Nay, not Kepler only, but the old Alexandrian, the Athenian of two thousand years ago, the Chaldean watching the heavenly motions another millennium away from us,—those who laid to the hands of Copernicus and Kepler the vast accumulation of materials for astronomical system,—all these are yet working in the midst of us, and for us. But astronomy itself is nothing without geometry. How purely contemplative, how utterly disconnected from the thought of practical application, were those studies of Euclid and Archimedes, which to later ages have proved the basis of practice in innumerable departments! In the Pythagorean and Platonic schools were laid the foundations of the Greek geometry; and there the superiority to practical considerations was matter of principle and of system: yet there were the Conic Sections studied, so as to enable Kepler and his successors, a thousand years after, to apply to the planetary orbits a complete doctrine of the properties of the ellipse, which had waited all that time for the manifestation of its utility. Look, then, at those abstracted and theoretic ancients; and then show me the practical man, the scale and the result of whose operations is, for mere usefulness, to be named with theirs. But it was a benefit they conferred unawares, or knowing only that truth is fruitful, that knowledge is ultimately power; and if they knew not of that benefit, how could it be foreseen, or commissioned, paid for beforehand, by any generation from theirs to ours? There is no application of physical truth which seems so like the multiplying the limbs, and extending prodigiously of an individual human presence, as the great series of the inventions of James Watt. Your city, as it stands, is almost his creation. To this there is no need to call your thoughts. But observe the nature of his preliminary inquiries. Who was likely to have considered as *practical*, the employments of a poor maker of mathematical instruments, devoting his too much leisure to mastering, testing, and extending Black's paradoxical theory of latent heat? It is the pulse of his brain that now throbs in all your engines; it is a great assemblage of speculative spirits which wields as its instrument the myriads of arms, and tools, and machines that stir around us. The men who in the very nature of things can never be appreciated, can never be hired, are the men that do the most even of that work which the world is readiest to value and remunerate."—Pp. 7—9.

Thus for its own good society is bound to maintain a succession of men not mainly or directly practical, who may furnish the workers with the facts and principles on which their several crafts depend. A provision for the investigations of pure mathematics is a provision for engineering, surveying, statistics, time-keeping, navigation; a provision for philosophical chemistry is a provision for dyeing, agriculture, the public and private care of health; a provision for a large and exact

literature and theology is a provision for that commerce with all ages which makes a nation truly a member of the great community of mankind. To secure such a provision is, according to Mr. Scott, the primary object of a university as distinguished from a school. Its men of learning and science must be not those who have merely qualified themselves to teach the special branch which they profess, although teaching is an essential part of their duty; they should, above all, love knowledge for its intrinsic worth and nobleness. Such men will ever be acquiring new stores of knowledge, and from the fulness of their minds will pour forth a fresh, pure and living stream of instruction. The recipients of such instruction will be, first, those who devote themselves to the search after truth; next, those whose vocation requires for its due discharge a general culture of mind and character; and lastly, all who are to possess leisure and ample means, and who regard these not as in themselves sufficient for the well-being of man or the discharge of his duties, but as involving responsibility for their careful culture and their employment as the means of social influence. We heartily wish that Mr. Scott and his colleagues may find in Manchester a sufficient supply of auditors of these three classes, and that he may be enabled to carry out his high, but we think just, views of his vocation. They have one great advantage—they can bide their time. If they find those who now guide public opinion too much disposed to take a narrow and merely practical view of education, they can wait till their own influence has diffused more enlarged conceptions through the community in which they live. If the demands first made upon them should be only for a kind of instruction which schools would more fitly supply, they can form their pupils to a higher taste, and excite in them a thirst for knowledge and a love of it for its intrinsic excellence and beauty.

Mr. Greenwood, in a sensible Address, sets forth the uses of classical learning and the study of ancient literature and history. To the objection that there can be no time for such studies, and that if there were they would prove of little use to the student in his after-life, he replies,

"The answer I would make, paradoxical as it may sound, is, that it is precisely because they will *not* be useful to him in the ordinary sense, that they should be so sedulously cultivated. The more absorbing these after pursuits are likely to prove, and the stronger their tendency to engross him with the material and the present, the more important is it that he should be familiar with pursuits which will sometimes allure him to converse with the great minds of other times and countries. Other branches of knowledge will be taught in this college, which, in addition to their value as a mental discipline, will prove of great use in their application to manufactures and commerce. With such studies, therefore, it is important in many ways that our students should be familiar; and I am too sensible of their value in counteracting the mischievous effects of an exclusive devotion to classics, to underrate them as an independent pursuit. But there is a danger on either side. As a too exclusive study of literature, unbalanced by the sterner discipline of the exact sciences, is apt to engender a vagueness of thought, a slavish deference to authority, and a loose and inconclusive style of reasoning, so the development of the reason, or, more correctly, of the understanding, alone, is likely to lead to a one-sided and disputatious frame of mind, a presumptuous and overweening self-reliance, which is as opposed to true knowledge as it is to wisdom. The most obvious corrective of this is a course of discipline, in which the master works of the master minds of all ages are set before the learner,—works which he is not invited to discuss and criticise in the first instance, but

to study with reverence and submission until he has gathered from the works themselves the power to judge them aright."—Pp. 35, 36.

Among the Addresses of the Scientific Professors, that of Mr. Williamson on the Study of Natural History is a very pleasing exhibition of the attractions of that pursuit, and indicates a comprehensive knowledge both of the principles and the details of his science, which from the mere study of external forms, its ancient limit, has been extended by John Hunter, Cuvier and Owen, so as to comprehend the great laws of animal and vegetable production and life. The following passage describes the illustration which human and comparative anatomy derive from each other:

"For the brilliant results obtained by Bichat, Bell, Marshall Hall, and Carpenter, we are not indebted to investigations of which man has been the sole subject, but to such as have been mainly prosecuted amongst the lower animals. It frequently happens that organs, which are unintelligible in man, because of their complication, assume a more simple form among some of the inferior creatures. By the examination of the latter, we are enabled to ascertain what is essential to the organ, and what is merely supplementary; we can thus read off the history of what we see in man, separating the typical structure of the organ from the vegetative excrescences by which its aspect has been modified and its nature rendered obscure. The human brain is one case in point; and another is afforded by what is called the *temporal* bone of the human skull. When merely viewed by the light which human anatomy affords, this bone is a most incomprehensible one, it being very difficult to assign its true osteological relation to the other parts of the skeleton. On tracing the same bone through a series of the lower vertebrate animals, we find that it is really an amalgamation of at least *five* bones, which, in fish, for instance, remain distinct to the end of life. Three of these are also distinct during the fœtal life of man, but become united into one at a very early period of his existence. I am aware that at present, relations of this kind may appear to you devoid of interest. They constitute, however, an important element in the pursuit of natural history, when conducted in the philosophical mode demanded by the present state of science.

"It is only within the last few years that due prominence has been given to the study of what are called anatomical homologies. The term *Homologue* is defined by Professor Owen as meaning 'the same organ, in different animals, under every variety of form and function.' Thus, the human hand and arm, the foreleg of the quadruped, the largely developed wing of the goose, and its more imperfect prototype in the ostrich, the anterior paddle of a porpoise, the wing of the fossil pterodactile or flying lizard, the anterior paddles of the great fossil saurians, and the pectoral fin of the fish, are all homologous organs, variously modified in form, to suit the different habits and external conditions of the individual animals. On the other hand, there is a small species of lizard, the Dracæna volans, or flying dragon, which also possesses limited powers of flight. The organ by which it accomplishes this is not the homologue of the wing of the bird or Pterodactyle; it is not the result of a modified development of the forearm, but of an enormous lateral prolongation of the ribs, supporting a thin extension of the skin which thus serves the purpose of a wing. Although the functions of the wings in the two cases are *analogous*, there is no *homological* relation existing between them."—Pp. 86—88.

The Lecture of Mr. Theodores on the Study of German is an instance of that command of the English language by a foreigner, of which Leonhard Schmitz, Mariotti, Mazzini, and above all Kossuth, have given such remarkable examples. From this gentleman's name, we should

conclude him to be a descendant of the ancient subjects of the Palæologi. He is said to rival Mithridates or Mezzofante in the number of the languages of which he is master; how he may write in the rest we cannot tell, but he sets forth in very good English the claims of German literature to form a part of English University education. England and Germany, he truly observes, have been engaged in a reciprocation of intellectual benefits; but when he alleges that the valiant and thinking race of blue-eyed and yellow-haired Saxons "converted the Druidic forest and fen into one smiling land of gardens," he appears to have forgotten that between the Druids and the Saxons there intervened some four centuries of Roman dominion and civilization.

The perusal of these Introductory Addresses leaves the conviction upon our minds, that the Trustees of Owens College have filled the various offices in their institution with men competent to their duties and anxious to discharge them rightly. The number of the students who have resorted to the College is sufficient, considering its recent opening, to warrant the expectation of its success. For reasons which no doubt are shared by many readers of the Christian Reformer, we shall watch its further progress with great interest.

K.

NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.*

We have to congratulate our friends of the Independent body on the completion and "inauguration" of their new collegiate building, erected for the education of ministers and laymen at St. John's Wood, near London. It is a spacious and beautiful edifice, and does great credit to the liberality and taste of those who have been concerned in its erection. It appeared to us, when looking through it some months ago, to be excellently adapted, in its different parts, for the purpose in view; and we can very sincerely give expression to the wish, that from its walls may issue, through long years to come, many well-trained and devout men for the work of the Christian ministry,—men able to render efficient aid to the cause of religious and social progress, and to serve, through the large and influential body to which they more immediately belong, the larger English community of which that body is no inconsiderable member.

The admiration we have felt in examining the "New College" has not, we must add, been altogether without alloy. We could not shut out from our minds the thought that, to some extent, *its* strength will be the weakness of a sister institution, which deserves, and perhaps needs, the support of the various Dissenting denominations. We allude to the withdrawal of Independent students from University College, London, consequent on the opening of the College at St. John's Wood. We confess that we should, for some reasons, have wished to see the former still, if possible, supported by the Congregational body, as well as by the various other Nonconformist denominations,—each, of course, with its own Hall or College in the neighbourhood, and its own provi-

* New College, London. The Introductory Lectures delivered at the Opening of the College, October, 1851. Pp. 268. London—Jackson and Walford.

sion for theological instruction. It would be at least a pleasant sight, to see the Dissenters not so divided and scattered over the country as they now are in their small educational institutions, but united together and forming one large and central University, worthy of the name. There can be little doubt that more frequent intercourse with each other, and especially the bringing together of their younger members in the classes and studies of a common and liberal education, would tend to produce or confirm mutual good feeling, respect and confidence, to remove causes of separation, and to unite all in a compact band for the maintenance and extension of that civil and religious freedom which, in these lands, owes so much to the joint efforts in past times of the Protestant Dissenters. This result, we are sorry to think, must now be less than ever contemplated as practicable, in reference at least to the Independents, and so far as its realization by the particular means alluded to is concerned; although we do not, it is needless to add, the less believe that that body will still be found zealous advocates, according to their knowledge and ability, of the principles of civil and religious liberty. On the contrary, for various reasons, we hope and believe that this will be the case, as time rolls on, more truly even than it has ever yet been.

"New College, London," originates, we are informed, in the union of three Colleges, viz., Homerton, Coward and Highbury, founded for the education of young men for the ministry among the Congregational Dissenters:

"It had long been felt that no advantages were secured by the existence of three separate Colleges, in the neighbourhood of London, whose object was the same and whose plans were nearly identical. At length, in 1848, a gentleman closely connected both with Homerton and Highbury Colleges gave expression to the general feeling in a letter on the subject, addressed to the Managers of the respective Institutions, pointing out the advantages of such an union, and suggesting means by which it might be carried into effect. His views were very favourably received by the Managers and supporters of the Institutions; and, after long and anxious deliberation, it was at length resolved to combine the three Colleges into one, in which a more extensive and efficient education might be given to the students for the ministry, than had been possible with the limited means at the disposal of each of the separate Colleges. In order to carry this resolution into effect, it was determined to sell the buildings belonging to the three Colleges, and with the proceeds of their sale to erect a new College, adapted to the wants of a more extensive course of study and of a larger number of students."—P. viii.

The building was commenced early in 1850, and finished the year after, the Introductory Address at the opening being delivered on the 1st of October, 1851, by the Rev. John Harris, D.D., Principal of the College. Before proceeding, as we propose to do, to offer some remarks on this Address and some of the other contents of the volume, we cannot refrain from expressing one or two thoughts which present themselves to us as of interest in connection with a certain other "New College," which, without further description, will be readily recognized by our readers.

In the first place, we have already alluded to the withdrawal of Independent students from University College, and have expressed the wish that, if it had been possible, this should not have taken place. We are aware that such withdrawal suggests considerations of importance in

reference to the future of our own Manchester institution, and it may be worth our while to look those considerations fully in the face. It may fairly be asked, How is it that, when the three original Colleges were free to adopt any arrangement for economizing their resources and increasing their efficiency, they did not, seeing they were already in the immediate neighbourhood of London, avail themselves of the advantages offered for secular instruction by University College? Why did they not, instead of going to a great expense in erecting a large collegiate building, with class rooms for both Theological and Literary courses, send their students for the secular portion of their course to the classes of University College? They were as free to unite themselves in Gower Street as at St. John's Wood; and they would, by so doing, have certainly avoided the expenditure of a large sum of money in building, and relieved themselves of the payment of salaries to the several Professors of the faculty of Arts.

That, in spite of these advantages, they chose to have no connection with the London College is the more remarkable, as Coward College, one of the three, had for some years past actually been in connection with it, and sent students to its classes for their secular instruction. It must, therefore, have been from no want of experience of the working of such a connection that it was not adopted for the others. Had this experience been favourable, we cannot but suppose, it may further be urged, that it would have led to connecting the Highbury and Homerton institutions in the same way. But not only are these not brought into Gower Street, but Coward College itself is now removed. We do not pretend to know the precise reasons for this abandonment of the union with University College, but it may be taken as presumptive evidence that it was found not to work well. And if so, we should be cautious, it may be added, how we place our own College in a similar position. At any rate, it should be ascertained what were the causes which led to the removal of Coward College, and how far they may be likely to apply to our own case. Valuable information could no doubt be given by the authorities of that College, as to the advantages and disadvantages of such a connection between a theological and a secular institution; and we hope that the Committee appointed to make inquiries for us in this important matter, will take care to satisfy themselves on the point.

In the second place, however, there is another fact to be noticed in connection with New College, London, which may be thought to go some way towards answering the queries suggested under our last head: we mean, the fact of the consolidation of the funds and resources of the three Colleges, and the formation of one larger and more efficient College. This example may perhaps be a useful one to the managers of our own institutions. *We* also have at least two separate academic institutions, neither of which can be considered in a satisfactory condition, as it is at present. Together, perhaps, they might be strong and effective. Even if it should be thought desirable to retain a tolerably complete staff of Professors of our own, and to remain in all important points independent of University College, as the Congregationalists have determined to be, it may be found that, with the united resources of Manchester New College and University Hall, such an arrangement would be practicable. We would not be understood as denying that,

in several important respects, the North of England, and Lancashire in particular, is the best locality for the education of the ministers of the Unitarian body. But in the face of a twelve years' trial in that locality and its visible results, and of the fact that there *are* the two institutions—the London Hall and the Manchester College—which, apart from each other, are comparatively so inefficient and expensive, but which, if united, and including in their classes the young laymen as well as the divinity students of our denomination, would probably be what Manchester New College has never yet been, and certainly does not now seem likely to become,—in the face of these facts, and of the decided preponderance of opinion now manifest in favour of London, we cannot any longer urge the suitableness of the North as the best locality for the College. Let, however, that suitableness have its due weight in the decision of the proper authorities, as doubtless it will; but they will no doubt remember also that in our case, as in that of the Independents, "union is strength," and disunion probable weakness and inefficiency.

In one other point the decision of the founders of New College, London, may perhaps be instructive to ourselves. They have abandoned the system of collegiate residence, and adopted that now followed at Manchester, of allowing the students to lodge, under supervision, in private families. Their determination is, we think, a wise one. It is generally admitted that in those instances in which residence in one building has been tried among ourselves, it has been found, to say the least, not so desirable for the students, or so favourable for study, as the plan of private lodgings or residence in a respectable family. Supposing, then, the decision of the Committee and Trustees of Manchester College, and the Proprietors of University Hall, to be in favour of a union of the two institutions, shall the plan of collegiate residence be adopted or not? University Hall is well suited, we believe, for the residence of a considerable number of students; but yet we trust that it will never be decided to return to that plan. The Hall could no doubt be put to very excellent use as a collegiate building containing Library and Lecture-rooms, and a residence for one or two Professors, with either or both of whom there might live, as in a private family, a small number of students. But this is a very different thing from turning it into the abode of some twenty or thirty of the latter; and we earnestly hope that this arrangement will not be seriously entertained. Oxford and Cambridge, with the revelations occasionally made of the evils of college residence there, should afford us timely warning,—to say nothing of the lessons we have had nearer home, in some of our own institutions.

We have allowed ourselves to dwell, at greater length than we at first intended, on the interesting topics suggested by the opening of the New College, and have left ourselves but little space to notice the contents of the volume which has given occasion to our remarks. We will now, however, endeavour briefly to do so. The Lecture which first claims our attention, as being *the* "Introductory Lecture," and the longest in the volume, is that delivered by the Principal, Dr. Harris. Its subject is the "Inspiration of the Scriptures." In this somewhat elaborate Address we have, we suppose, the latest expression of opinion on this subject from among the Congregational Dissenters, and one

which no doubt represents views widely received among them. It is therefore interesting, independent of its own intrinsic merits or demerits. As the result of a brief inquiry into what the author terms "the Biblical idea of inspiration," he is led to give us the following definition:—"*Inspiration*, as distinct from revelation, is, subjectively considered, a supernatural state of mind, consciously resulting from the direct agency of the Holy Spirit, and designed to secure the oral and written communication of such truth, and in such a manner, as Infinite Wisdom deems requisite for the present and future benefit of mankind." (P. 42.) To examine the inquiry by which this definition is attained or verified, and the *evidence* by which the supposed Biblical claim to such inspiration is sought to be established, would require more space than we can command. But we may shortly state, that the impression left on us by what Dr. Harris says, is, that he deals too much in general, abstract statements and reasonings, for the Lecture, as a defence or explanation of the "inspiration" of the actual concrete book, the Bible, to be of any real value. All the reasoning or theorizing in the world as to how "inspiration" may have been imparted; how the mind of the prophet or apostle may have been affected; how a person, though inspired, may preserve his individual characteristics and use his own words, and so forth, can be of no avail against undeniable facts lying before us in the pages of the Bible. For illustration, take the earlier part of St. John's account of the resurrection, and compare it with the corresponding part of St. Matthew's: which of the two is to be regarded as the one proceeding from "a supernatural state of mind" in the evangelist, designed to secure the written communication of the truth in this case? Or if there were, indeed, any such supernatural state of mind in *both* evangelists, in what has it the advantage over that natural and ordinary state of mind which impels a narrator to write the simple truth, such as, after due inquiry, or without inquiry, he honestly believes it to be, and which yet leaves him liable to occasional errors of detail?

Dr. Harris, again, as it appears to us, makes too little distinction, in his statements, between the inspiration of living prophets and apostles, and that of the *books* which preserve their words and relate their actions. In fact, he speaks first of the one, then of the other, indiscriminately, passing backwards and forwards as suits his convenience, just as though the two were one and the same thing. In the moral and religious inspiration of some of the great personages of Scripture, we may believe as truly as Dr. Harris; while, at the same time, we may be constrained to deny the reality and the need of any inspiration of, or in, or in any way belonging to, the *writings* through which we attain our knowledge of them. For example, St. Luke was not an apostle, though probably the companion of apostles. What evidence is there that he, in particular, was "inspired," in the sense given to that word by Dr. Harris? If, then, he were not so inspired, was it therefore impossible that he should give us a sufficient and credible account of the life of our Saviour? What more is needed for the adequate representation to us of Christ's life and teachings, than that the evangelist should record what he believes to be the truth in regard to what he has seen and heard? We suppose it will not be maintained that the deeds and words of Christ were of so difficult or transcendental a character

(if we may use the expression) that the beholder or hearer must have been "inspired," in order to see and appreciate them with sufficient correctness. If so, then all the early disciples of Jesus must have been "inspired," and all his modern disciples must be so too! But if this supposition be untenable, what advantage or satisfaction, we ask again, do the advocates of any proper "inspiration of the Scriptures" enjoy, more than they who think that it was only necessary for their writers to desire to state the truth, as it appeared to them, and as any faithful historian would do, in order to transmit to the future ages of Christianity a sufficient knowledge of its origin and leading principles?

Dr. Harris speaks vaguely of "the Canonical Books in general" (p. 35), appearing, and we presume intending, to class all together, as one common product of "inspiration." Does he mean then to say that the respective authors of the Book of Esther—of the thirty-sixth of Genesis—of the hundred and ninth Psalm—must have written these several portions of the Old Testament in "a supernatural state of mind, consciously resulting from the direct agency of the Holy Spirit"? We could multiply questions and considerations similar to the foregoing, which seem to us to prove clearly the essential falseness of this theory of "the inspiration of the Scriptures," when tested by the actual facts of the case, and conclusively to shew that it has pleased the Supreme Father to permit the records of his revelations of Himself to His children of mankind to be composed and preserved in accordance with ordinary, natural laws and influences, as knowing that this would be all-sufficient for the purposes which He had in view.

We must add to the foregoing remarks, that we desire to be understood as sympathizing fully with the spirit of reverence for the Scriptures which this Lecture exhibits. It is our reverence for that Book of books, in fact, and our desire that real justice should be done to it, that leads us to protest against the theory of inspiration, as commonly understood. We believe that theory to be really injurious to the Bible and to Christianity. If either can be shewn to be maintainable only along with it, then should we, indeed, fear for the permanent reception and authority of both. Besides this, we believe that the doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture exercises an immediate and positive influence, which is unfavourable to the just appreciation and fair literary treatment of the Bible. We might find evidence of this in the ordinary Biblical literature of the day. An instance has just presented itself. In the North British Review for February, in an article headed "The Literature of the New Testament," the writer pleads as against the probability of St. Matthew having written an Aramæan Gospel, of which our present Matthew is only a version, the "consequences" of this admission to the doctrine of inspiration in the case of that Gospel. We think, moreover, that we find some evidence to the same effect, in the character of the Divinity course the outline of which is given in the volume before us, as that to be adopted in the New College. We speak with some hesitation on the point, because it may be that the outline proposed leaves out of view some even of the more important subjects of study. But, taking the Biblical course as it is presented, it appears to be of too elementary and limited a character to meet the wants of the day, and to leave out some matters of prominent interest and importance at the present time. We can hardly

expect inquiries of the kind we now refer to, into the origin, structure and age of the leading books of the Scriptures, to be much valued by those who can take up the Bible at once, just as it is, as an "inspired" book. We *should*, however, have expected that the *reading* of these so highly estimated Scriptures would have held a more important place in the general scheme. Yet in the Hebrew we observe the reading of the entire Divinity course is limited to Genesis, part of the Psalms, and Job; while, on the other hand, time is to be spared for Syriac, and even for Arabic. And we see the same evil influence in a statement made in the Lecture by Professor Nenner, in which he informs us that "the object of Biblical Exegesis, both of the Old and New Testaments," is "the elimination, on sound principles, of the statements of the Bible itself respecting these doctrines"—the doctrines, that is to say, which may be formed into "a system."

The other Theological Lectures contained in the volume are the one just referred to, on "the Exegesis of the Old Testament," by the Rev. M. Nenner, and one, introductory to the New-Testament course, by the Rev. J. H. Godwin, on "the Earliest Form of Christianity." We must pass them by with the single remark that they bear marks of earnestness and ability, such as claim for their authors the confidence of the supporters of the College.

The whole period of study, combining the Theological with the Literary course, is to extend over five years. Of these, two are devoted to the Literary and three to the Theological; and the former "may be abridged, or dispensed with, in the case of students who are found, upon examination, to possess such an amount of proficiency in learning as to qualify them for entrance upon the Theological course." We are also informed that "the classes of the Faculty of Arts are open to all students above fifteen years of age without any religious tests." We infer that this exemption does not extend to Theological students.

In a collection of Introductory Lectures like this, it is difficult to give variety, or avoid an appearance of repetition; and, however good each individual discourse may be, the effect is apt to be somewhat marred by the juxtaposition of the rest, all making claims equally urgent in behalf of different branches of knowledge. In these Lectures, however, there is less of this unfavourable effect than might have been anticipated. The authors have been content to view their respective courses as parts of one great and general course, and to rest their claims, not on the paramount or exclusive importance of their own departments, but on their utility in subservience to the whole. This is especially the case with the literary and scientific portion of the Lectures. The writers have very wisely insisted upon the value of their particular branches in developing and training, rather than in informing, the mind of the student. They are to be estimated by their efficacy in giving power and skill to those faculties on which success in any profession will subsequently depend. In a word, it is on their value as a discipline of the mind, that the claims of Classical, Mathematical and Physical studies are here mainly based. This is undoubtedly the true view of the matter, and it is the one which the declaimers against the utility of the pure sciences or of classics in education, generally manage to overlook or avoid—imagining that they have demonstrated the worthlessness of Classics or Mathematics, as a study

for young men, when they have asserted that no direct use is made of them in the ordinary pursuits of business, or that they themselves have never been inconvenienced by the want of them.

It is unnecessary for us to examine or criticise at length the Lectures of the Professors of Classics, Mathematics and Natural Science. It will suffice to state, in a few words, how each has chosen to view the subject of his course. Dr. William Smith, avoiding as superfluous any formal discussion as to the importance of his department, has given a rapid, yet lucid and comprehensive, sketch of the history of Classical learning and literature; to which he has added a few excellent hints to students on the best mode of availing themselves of the opportunities which a College course affords. The Lecture of the Rev. Philip Smith is an able vindication of the claims of pure Mathematics to a place in the education of a Christian minister, whose subsequent duties and pursuits do certainly, at first sight, seem less likely to be aided by Mathematical than by Classical studies. Dr. Lankester, to whom the instruction in Natural Science has been committed, advocates this study in its various branches of Geology, Botany, Physiology, &c., as bringing a student into immediate acquaintance with the most palpable proofs of adaptation and benevolent design in the universe, and as being an important means of developing and training the powers of observation and comparison.

We have stated that, of the five years of which the New College course consists, two only are given to the secular portion. The study even of the Classics is not continued beyond the second session, except in so far as the reading of the Apostolic Fathers (if in the original) may be reckoned under that head. We think that with the majority of students this arrangement will be unfavourable to their scholarship, unless, indeed, they commence their course at a more advanced age than is usual. Nor do we see how, by this means, the requirements of the London University are to be complied with, as two years must intervene between matriculation and graduation, and the first College year is frequently occupied in preparing for matriculation.

THE CONTRIVING MIND IN ANIMALS.

Individual instances of what in human beings we should call contriving mind have been remarked in animals. The Squirrel's mode of passing a river, by a boat, or raft, of their own making,—the Jerboa's provision for his escape if attacked in his retreat,—the Opossum's mode of obtaining crabs which his paws cannot reach,—the Monkey's use of his tail as a hand or finger,—the Peruvian Hare's two chambers for distinct uses,—the Otter's providing against the rise of the tide or river,—the Honey Weasel's averting the glare of the sun,—the Monkey's imitation of the astronomers who were measuring the length of a degree in Peru,—the Indian Monkey's resolute mode of self-defence,—the Bear himself finding out the plant that will heal his wound, and making and applying a plaster from it,—the Wolf's cautious reasoning amid his hunger and voracity,—are instances of this sort. The Wolf, with artful judgment, will take the babe from the mother's bed so gently as not to disturb her. They also resolutely co-operate in their fatal attacks.—*Sharon Turner's Sacred History*, 6th ed., Vol. I. pp. 403, 404.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

Sir,

Those who were present at the special meeting of the Trustees of the College in December, must have been impressed with the fact that the present is a crisis in the history of this institution; and as your full and accurate report of the proceedings has made them generally accessible, it is surely the duty of every one who has formed a deliberate opinion on the subject, to offer it as a suggestion for the use of the Committee appointed to consider the question. Influenced by this consideration, I was already preparing to write to you on the subject, when I received the Christian Reformer for February; and I find in it two letters on this same topic, which will somewhat modify what I have to say, but will not, I fear, enable me to bring it within narrower limits, since, while one of them contains much with which I agree, and in some respects anticipates my remarks, the other contains still more from which I fundamentally differ, and on which I shall beg leave to offer some comments.

The question concerning the collegiate education of our young men for the ministry is no longer simply one of *locality*, but also one of *plan* and *method*—not merely *where* they shall be trained, but also *how*—and the present position of affairs offers a good opportunity for considering the matter as a whole. The question appears to me to be three-fold. 1. What is the object to be sought in a collegiate institution supported by Unitarians for the education of those who are to be their ministers? 2. By what processes, kinds and methods of training is this object most likely to be attained in the case of the great majority of the students,—universal, unexceptional success being impossible? 3. What locality furnishes the greatest advantages for the use of these methods of training? These three questions I will try to answer, candidly stating the impressions of my own mind, without wishing to speak dogmatically or to deny that I may be mistaken, especially on the points in which I find myself differing from those for whose motives and judgment I have a deep respect.

1. The object we have in view is to educate Unitarian ministers. A simple phrase, but one so comprehensive, that he who undertakes to prepare either himself or another for that office, must tremble when he thinks how much it requires. Your correspondent who signs himself "A Constant Reader," commences his enumeration of the "points on which we are all agreed" by stating that "Unitarian theology can have no attraction" except for the men of learning and cultivated intellect,—that we must endeavour to gain "in *quality* what we have lost, and have no prospect of recovering, in *quantity*." If I thought this were true,—if I believed that our religion is fitted only for the scholar and the philosopher,—if I could not find in it any power to sweeten the lot of poverty, to cheer the toil of the sweating millions, and to gain a glad audience from "the common people," I should care no more about the question, but should be content to leave the scholars and philosophers to get their ministry their own way, or to do without it, which, with their mental and literary resources, *they*, better than any other class, probably could. But I totally deny the fact. In my own experience, I have found far more religion, far more interest in Unitarian theology, and zeal for its maintenance and propagation, among the poor and those called the uneducated, than among the rich. And the facts of which the pages of the Reformer contain a record during the last few years confirm the assertion. In the No. for the present month, the intelligence concerning the Christian Brethren at Mossley, with their Sunday-school of 750 scholars and their subscription of £600, and concerning Nantwich, where a meeting is reported to have lasted six hours without signs of weariness, in both which places nearly all the members belong to the working class, confirms the assertion. And I will appeal to any minister to say from which class the most attentive audience, the most unwearied listeners, the keenest

inquirers are derived,—whether he has not more reason to hope he produces an impression when speaking to Lancashire cotton-spinners or Cheshire shoemakers, than when he preaches to more polished and cultivated hearers. I doubt also if Channing need fear a comparison with Whitfield or Wesley, Hall or Chalmers, in the extent and power of his influence over the popular mind. To acknowledge that Unitarianism is unfitted for the poor and the unlearned, is to acknowledge that it is not Christianity; our most bitter adversary could not make a more injurious and destructive assertion. The day on which I am convinced of the truth of this assertion shall be the last day of my being a Unitarian.

I dwell on this point because I think this (as I believe) fallacy is at the root of much of the argument about the College which appears to support conclusions from which I differ. It was observed by several of the speakers at the meeting of Trustees, that it was necessary the divinity students should be "scholars" and "gentlemen," in order that they might be able to associate with the influential members of their future congregations; and that it was very desirable that this companionship should commence at College by their being fellow-students with the lay students belonging to our body. I see and feel the force of this argument; but I was astonished that the gentlemen using it did not perceive the necessity for our ministers being also able to associate with the poor and the unlearned. Where you have one "gentleman," even in the most "select and genteel" congregation, you probably have two or three "working men;" and our object must be to render our ministers fit to minister to both classes, or we shall fail to do our duty.

When we say, then, that we are seeking to educate young men to be Unitarian ministers, we mean that we aim at making them scholars, gentlemen, theologians—but also philanthropists, Christian missionaries, sympathizers with the toiling, the down-trodden and the outcasts,—popular in speech, in action and in exertion,—capable of sustaining the interest and aiding the devotions of the cultured and the instructed classes, and also capable of converting sinners and instructing the ignorant and seeking and bringing back the lost sheep.

2. How is this object to be attained? Our present plan has not succeeded. Small, comparatively speaking, as the number of students has been at Manchester, out of this small number several have not become ministers, and those in several cases the men of the keenest intellectual powers and the highest scholarship. "A Constant Reader" assumes that the "place" of the College is the cause of the small number of students, but would find it difficult to prove it. For if a young man really wishes to be a minister, would he abandon the profession rather than be educated at Manchester? And if he does not care for the profession, but is tempted into it by the allurements of a London education, is not the profession better without him? An intellectual training displaying more attractions than that at Manchester has shewn (it would be difficult to find one offering more solid advantages), might gain more students, but would it produce more ministers? In the present state of our body, I think not.

But while I deny that the locality of the College has anything to do with the small number of students, I think the mode of instruction and the system pursued may affect this, and I agree with the plan sketched by your correspondent "C." as a partial remedy. It is evident that the one essential means of increasing the number of divinity students is to open the way and to offer attractions to those young men who are in a state of mind which would be termed in some bodies of Christians, "having a call"—that is, who are filled with a genuine and strong desire for "the work of the ministry." All others, as far as possible, we must positively and peremptorily exclude. Now young men with this feeling will be anxious to employ themselves in preliminary labours, even while at College: Sunday-school teaching, village and cottage preaching, aggressive efforts on vice, intemperance and ignorance, will be

their best refreshment in the midst of study. If you deny them opportunities for such exertions, or discourage them in seeking such, during the six or even during three years of College life, at the period when character is most rapidly formed and habits are soonest acquired, you either drive them from your College, or destroy the very essence of the ministerial character within them.

The means to be employed, then, are—1, direct—the usual apparatus of lectures, examinations, reading, &c., to communicate knowledge; 2, indirect —the employment in all such labours, and the training in such pursuits, as foster a love of the out-of-pulpit exertions of the ministerial profession, and an aptitude in the discharge of them. The first of these has been always attended to; but I would respectfully ask, has the second been sufficiently remembered and provided for?

3. What *locality* offers most advantages for this purpose? I think no one will doubt that, as far as the secular part of education is concerned, London, with its University College and University Hall, is the most promising. But as far as theological teaching goes, any place has equal facilities, because the theological Professor or Professors can move with the College; whereas, in looking at the indirect part of a minister's education, the influences acting on him out of the College walls, I see no possibility of denying that Manchester is the proper place. To prove this, let me mention that Manchester is the centre of fifty Unitarian congregations, all within the reach of an hour or two's railway ride, supporting Sunday-schools to the number of 7000 children, including several missions to the poor and village missions, and offering to the student every opportunity for learning pastoral duties, for gaining a knowledge of the wants of the working class, and for cultivating that love of active ministerial pursuits, without which no minister can be thoroughly useful or quite happy. At the same time, Manchester offers means of indirect *intellectual* training, good society, and contact with cultured and powerful minds, to a degree second only to London itself. And here, more than anywhere else in the kingdom, it is likely to be true of our students, what Charles Dickens says of our transatlantic brethren, that "they recognize a world, and a broad one too, lying beyond the College walls."

To my mind, then, it seems certain that London offers the greatest advantages for the literary and scientific education of a divinity student, and would bring him into contact with the laymen who are likely hereafter to form the influential members of his congregation; but that Manchester offers philanthropic and popular influences which will make him better able to mix with and be useful among the poor; in fact, that a London education for six years would actually *disqualify* him for being anything but what a neighbour of mine is termed by his poorer hearers, "a gentleman's parson." I am not advocating the neglecting such steps as will make our ministers acceptable to the higher ranks; I would not lower in any way the standard of education; but the poor have at least an equal claim on our forethought and attention. None can deny that our ministers are as a body distinguished for scholarship and intellectual power; may we not try, without losing these characteristics, to add to them the zeal, the popular activity, the philanthropic energy, the extensive influence over the "lower orders," so perceptible among some other bodies of Christians? At least, our Unitarian College should aim at doing this.

For this purpose I would respectfully suggest to the Trustees the following plan:—To institute in Manchester a Divinity School, on the plan recommended by "C.," giving a three or four years' course of theology exclusively, but allowing only as large an annual exhibition to each student as is at present given. Let no student be admitted to this school till he is a graduate, unless he can give weighty reasons for not graduating, and then on passing an examination by the Professors, and in every case let the candidate for admission be at least eighteen, and pass an examination in the elements of the Hebrew language. Let the last year of the College course be so arranged

that a considerable portion of the student's time may be devoted, under Professorial guidance, to preaching, visiting the poor, &c.; and let the renewal of the exhibition at the close of each year be conditional on the Trustees receiving a decidedly favourable report from the Professors.

So far my plan agrees with that of "C." in everything except not costing so much. But at the same time with this, I would have the College funds employed in supporting a number of young men at University Hall, who should attend the University College classes for three years. Thus, when a youth of sixteen was presented to the Trustees as a candidate for admission, it being stated that he was anxious to be a minister, they might inquire minutely into his case, and if they thought him very promising, might enter him in London. After he had gone through his course there and had graduated, he would come before them again, and if the fair promise of his earlier years were not fulfilled,—if the Professors could not report that from private personal intercourse they found him of so devout, earnest, single-minded a character, that he was likely to be a good and useful minister and pastor,—he would not be admitted to the Theological course. It is true, three years would thus be thrown away; but this is better than giving five or six years, and not making a man into a minister after all, as is often the case now. And the advantage would be, that if on the first application the prospect was not decidedly encouraging, only of an indifferent character, the Trustees might fairly say, "Go on with your studies, graduate, and then apply again; and if you keep in the same mind, we will then admit you, and you may at least obtain your religious training." The number of students having a secular education would thus be always less than the number in the theological establishment, consisting only of those about whose ultimate success and usefulness there could be no reasonable doubt; while others who received support from other funds or private sources during the first part of their College training, would join the theological school at the expiration of that period.

It appears to me we should thus have the advantages of both localities, the more powerful arguments on both sides would be met and yielded to, and the highest intellectual and purest moral influences would unite to form men fit to carry on the battle of truth and liberty and goodness in this time of difficulty and danger.

I have suppressed several details, and have striven to suggest an idea which has been on my mind for years, rather than fully to work it out. Should it meet with any acceptance, this will easily be done.

M. N. C.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

Sir,

A reply to some of the inquiries as to matters of fact made by "A Constant Reader" in your last No., may interest some of your readers.

The term "vicinage" occurs in the original foundation of Manchester College. With reference to this and the other terms of the foundation, a "case" was drawn up, in the year 1848, by two legal gentlemen, members of the Special Committee of College Trustees, and of whom one was in favour of Manchester, the other of London, as the desirable locality. The case so drawn up was submitted to Mr. Bethell and Mr. Roundell Palmer, of the Chancery bar, who gave it as their joint opinion that the proposed removal of the institution could not lawfully be effected; that the original objects of the charity were clearly local; and that whatever departure from them might have taken place by the removal from Manchester to York in 1803, has now been rectified by the return to Manchester.

The removal to York took place at a time when no one was prepared to

undertake the responsibility of carrying on the College at Manchester. Mr. Wellbeloved was willing to make the experiment at York. At York it remained, it would seem on sufferance, for thirty-seven years. Towards the close of that period, the opinion was put forth that any Trustee of the College, or even any inhabitant of Manchester, had the power to compel its return.

Of course a private Act of Parliament, if obtained, would legalize a removal to London, or any other proceeding. Upon the probability of obtaining one, I can say little from any knowledge of my own. What I have been able to learn upon the subject by inquiry, is to the effect that the passing of any such Act is watched with strict regard to the rights of any person who may be affected by it; that such an Act would not be passed if opposed by any of the Trustees, or even by any of the inhabitants of Manchester; and that probably, though less certainly, Parliament might also consider the rights of future Trustees or future inhabitants, whose consent cannot be given, and whose acquiescence cannot be implied.

A Trustee of Manchester College.

THE MORMONS.

Sir,

Whilst, in common with your other readers, I feel much indebted to the reviewer of the history of the Mormons for the interesting information he has afforded relative to this singular and much-misunderstood people, I must at the same time respectfully, but very earnestly, protest against the almost *brusque* manner in which he has run the parallel between the trumpery, bungling imposture of the Mormon golden Book and the Bible. Nothing, I am sure, could be farther from your correspondent's intention than to treat with levity the only authentic record the world possesses of its earliest history as well as of divine revelation, and yet I fear that to many minds a painful feeling of indecorum will present itself as the sentence is read, "The Book of the Mormons is grammatically and historically incorrect. The same objections apply in no small degree to the Bible." From the loose manner in which the paragraph is worded, it does not appear whether by "the Bible" is meant the whole work we call so, viz., the Old and the New Testaments, or the Old Testament alone; for in popular estimation this only is the Bible, according to the common phrase, "the Bible and the Testament." Now, to me, it is very difficult to understand what is meant by the grammatical incorrectness of the Bible. The Old Testament is a book *sui generis*. The language in which it is for the greater part written is peculiar to it, and we are in no position to decide on its merely verbal accuracy. If the charge be at all true, it must fall on the translation, and let it alone bear the blame, if any. Still less can it be said of the New Testament. Paul and Luke, the chief writers, were men of education and accustomed to composition. Matthew, the tax-gatherer, must have been no contemptible penman, and was well able to express himself with clearness and precision. Peter and John were "unlearned and ignorant men," as our translation has it, but the reviewer needs not to be informed that this means no more than they had not sat at the feet of some Gamaliel, and had not been instructed in the vain traditions of the elders, "the hair-splitting of the Jewish schools." But "*historical* incorrectness" is a yet heavier charge, especially in juxtaposition with the Mormon revelation. How has your reviewer substantiated it? By no manner of means. It stands out in all its vagueness to make what impression it may; a salutary one it cannot. I protest entirely against the parallel; nor do I more approve that attempted to be shewn between some of the recorded actions of Moses, David and Solomon, and those of Smith and his followers, whether truly reported or not. The Old-Testament worthies had their treasures in earthen vessels, and are never held

up as models for complete imitation, any more than for indiscriminate admiration. I will merely remark in this connection that Moses killed the Egyptian in defending his oppressed brethren, and that by every law, divine and human, it was justifiable homicide. Had an enemy said this, we could have borne it; but thou, our companion, our friend! No more than your correspondent do I contend for the plenary verbal inspiration of the Bible; yet I have always thought there was much truth and value in the remark of Hartley, which I quote from memory, that "he who goes to the Scriptures with the very lowest idea of their inspiration will, by repeated and reverential perusal of them, come at length to the conviction of their possessing almost, if not altogether, the highest." I cannot for a single instant, or for any purpose, consent to compare the book of Revelation with the contemptible, if not blasphemous reveries of Joe Smith.

The Mormons, in the view of your reviewer, are a people quite as much sinned against as sinning. I hope that the accession of fresh facts will amply confirm his conclusions, but it is somewhat singular that in the current No. of Dickens's Household Narrative, their conduct is painted in very dark colours. We are informed that "The New York Police Gazette contains a mass of shocking details relative to the proceedings of the Mormons at the Salt Lake. A correspondent of that paper, writing from Utah, says, 'The pluralist wife system is in full vogue here. Governor Young is said to have ninety wives. * * * It is said Heber C. Kimball, one of the Triune Council and the second person in the Trinity, has almost an equal number. * * * Each man has as many wives as he can maintain, that is, after the women have been picked and culled by the head men. Whole pages might be filled with the surprising, disgusting details of the state of affairs here.' It is a lamentable fact that at the present time numbers of people are leaving Great Britain to join the Mormons, notwithstanding the disclosures that are so constantly made."

S. G.

*** It had been our intention, before perusing the above letter, to add a postscript to the article on Mormonism published in the February No. of the Christian Reformer. We did not then see fit to notice at length the charge of immorality brought against the Mormon community, as being based on insufficient and interested evidence. But subsequent advices from America have thrown upon this part of the subject a new and an unfavourable light. The officials of the Supreme Court of the United States, who have lately been compelled to abdicate their functions in Utah, bring reports, which from men of presumed standing and character we cannot refuse to believe, of the practice of polygamy by the Mormon leaders. We have no means of forming an opinion as to the merits of the quarrel likely to break out afresh between the Mormons and their fellow-citizens of the United States. Our only business is to state what, in spite of manifest exaggerations in the account, we reluctantly believe to be a fact.

With regard to the charge brought against us by S. G. of running an "almost brusque" parallel between the Book of Mormon and the Bible, our first impulse was one of unmixed astonishment that it was not refuted by its own weight and improbability. We need hardly say that we plead not guilty. That a parallel has been run, and is daily run, between the two books, by Mormons and their ignorant converts, we admit; but our style has been in fault, if in S. G.'s estimation we have at all taken the responsibility of that parallel on ourselves. The popular mind in England, trained up, if trained at all, in orthodox theology, receives the Bible as a single book of equal authority throughout,—ascribes the same moral validity to David's maledictions and Christ's promises,—looks for moral sanctions to Old and New Testament alike,—knows nothing of translations,—and regards the Authorized Version as *the Book*. We have ourselves heard one who was raised far above the class from which Mormon converts are usually supplied, declare, totidem verbis,

that in the Bible every i had been dotted and every t crossed by the direct instrumentality of the Holy Spirit. We have known one who had received a university education plead in excuse of fornication, that David was a fornicator and yet the man after God's own heart. Now, against men who entertain these views, we cannot wonder that the Mormon arguments to which we have alluded, and which, moreover, are not hypothetical on our part, but in every case such as have been actually used, have a personal force. If the language of the translators of the Bible be not in accordance with modern usage, S. G. can refer to Chaucer, Wycliffe, Latimer, for a vindication; if statements in the Old Testament be hard to reconcile or irreconcilable with profane history, S. G. does not invest them with the unlimited authority of inspiration; if "Old-Testament worthies" prove to "have their treasures in earthen vessels," S. G. knows that there is but one life offered to his entire imitation by the sacred records, and anchors his faith on the Gospels. But this, "in medio tutissimus," is an unknown way to the ignorant opponents of Mormonism. Bibliolatrists, they worship they know not what; and incapacitated for a true reverence of the most divine of all books, they are easily led away to the shrine of a false Deity.

If our language has been ambiguous, we trust that it is now fully explained, and that we have vindicated ourselves from the charge of being either reverent towards the Book of Mormon or irreverent towards the Bible. It has long been the case that those who make any impartial attempt to write the history of religious opinion, are accused of heresy if they are not unfair towards heretics. Yet in this case the enormous popularity of Mormonism among the lower classes of this country, is a fact which needs explanation; and we believe that such explanation will for the most part be found in the false estimate of the authority of the Bible *as a whole*, which incapacitates an ignorant orthodoxy from denying the pretensions of a Book of Mormon.

C.

ARTICLES OF FAITH.

"Articles of Faith" should be as "Articles of Apprenticeship"—apprenticeship to the Truth. If we know that we have as yet but imperfectly learned the things that we believe, and desire that their character and faculty may be more fully unfolded for us, then they are as a chosen company of affectionate disciples, of distinct characters, and fit for distinct offices, agreeing to learn together of one master the Truth, and sitting at his feet in reverent trust and dependence. But if we be loud, vain and stubborn, then the things we believe are a rabble of propositions, that come forth with the dark lantern of prejudice and the club of bigotry, to seize and bind the Truth, betrayed thus to bondage and death, so far as we have power of death, by the Judas of our worldly policy.—*T. Lynch.*

POPULAR FAITH.

What is faith? Look around upon the religious professors you know, and ask yourself if the faith of the greater part of them is anything else than a trusting in man? Can you for a moment suppose that there would be such an endless diversity of sects among Christians (all, you are to remember, professing to derive their views from the Bible), if it were not that they do trust in man, and nothing else?—*Visiting my Relations.*

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Westminster Review, No. CXL., Jan. 1852. John Chapman.

The *Westminster* gives promise, under its new proprietorship, of great improvement and vigour. There are many articles which indicate well-applied talent, and some of which we can praise the talent, but scarcely commend its application. The author of the article on the Ways and Works of Shell-fish, writes pleasantly and instructively on a not common subject. The writer on "Mary Stuart" is as vehement in his antipathies as North-British writers on this subject usually are in their partialities. Without committing ourselves to any defence of the morals of the Queen of Scots, we dissent from the reviewer's unqualified conclusions in favour of the sincerity of the Queen of England. We can scarcely comprehend the mind which can escape the conviction of Elizabeth's profound dissimulation. That Davison, the unhappy Secretary, was the victim of his sovereign's subtle and selfish policy, is, we had thought, an established fact. Few English readers of the article on the state of affairs in France, will feel any gratitude for the flimsy panegyric on French Socialism. This is admitted as an independent contribution, and is not protected by editorial sanction. It is the blot of the No. The account of Julia von Krudener, the coquette and mystic, is entertaining, but affords materials for a better philosophical analysis of the character than appears. The "Relation between Employers and Employed," is very ably discussed. The writer commands the entire question, and makes it clear to the reader. The relation of employer and employed is perplexed to the apprehension of many in both classes, by the tacit or express intrusion of claims that do not belong to it. Once, that relation was one of servitude and ownership; again, it was that of feudal vassal and feudal chief; now, it is neither, but a simple contract between man and man. But beyond the terms of this contract the employer is apt to claim deference, and the employed to expect bounty. The deference may be right as between men and citizens; the bounty may be right and Christian as from the brother in affluence to the brother in comparative need. But they both belong to wider social relations than that of employer and employed. And the duties which thus lie upon the employer as man and Christian, press equally or more strongly, in point of fact, upon many who seem perfectly unconscious of the obligation, while deriving their income, without risks or anxieties, from investments which ultimately indeed employ labour, but which do not bring them into personal contact with the labourer. Such easy gentlemen may be found cursing the manufacturer for giving profitable employment to thousands with advantage to himself as a capitalist, and insinuating that the duties of a feudal lord rest also upon him towards those very free and independent workmen who, in point of fact, leave his service whenever they can find a better, and strike for wages whenever they think they can gain an advance. The reviewer shews, in a very forcible manner, how it is the employer's first *duty* (his duty to the employed and to society) to make his manufacture remunerative to himself; a doctrine intuitively felt by proprietors of land as well as proprietors of cotton-mills, and made clearly intelligible by the Westminster reviewer.

We should like to see the application of the broad principles so well laid down, made by the same lucid pen, to the present *Engineers' Strike*. On the broad principle that the relation between employer and employed is one of mutual contract, it follows that each party is entitled to make the best terms he can for himself. But, as in all other contracts, there are external limitations (chiefly in the competitions of other parties, whether as employers or employed) which unite with the moral sense to restrain either party from exacting permanently or prevailingly unjust terms. Further, in settling the terms of this contract, it is perfectly legitimate that men seeking employment should unite

in a common understanding as to their labour's worth and its conditions; and equally so, that employers seeking workmen should unite in some kind of understanding as to what they will offer and under what conditions. If the former ask too much, or the latter offer too little, the parties in question will soon adjust their mutual demands. Trades' unions and masters' unions are both perfectly legitimate, as the means of mutual understanding and joint action; but trades' unions or masters' unions may overstep the line of legality or (short of that) the line of right. They may oppress the weaker of their own class, or they may encroach upon the equal and corresponding rights of the other contracting parties.

At the beginning of the present dispute, the "Amalgamated Society of Operative Engineers" were clearly and entirely in the wrong. The great power of their union (not a moral force only, but physical also) was turned against the natural rights of two classes of their fellow-workmen, namely, the best skilled and most industrious workmen, who gain the due advantage of their skill by piece-work and occasional over-hours, according to the exigencies of business; and also the unskilled men, who can attend a lathe or other self-acting machine, without having undergone an apprenticeship to skilled work. In demanding the abolition of piece-work and over-time, and the adoption of skilled labourers (of course at skilled-labour prices) for the performance of unskilled work, the union was at the same time invading the rights of the employers. The explanations and evasions of Mr. Newton and others have only shewn yet more plainly that they were consciously in the wrong. And there is no doubt that multitudes of workmen are ashamed and grieved at the abuse made by their executive seven of the powers delegated to their hands. The men were entirely wrong in the outset; but we fear the masters are taking a step by way of reprisal which will leave them no longer entirely in the right. If they should insist, as conditions of giving future employment, upon a workman signing a declaration to the effect that he is not nor will be connected with any union for prescribing the terms of work, &c., this will be retaliating upon the men the very same injustice which the men first committed. The master may specify his terms, and agree, if he can, with other masters in so doing; and if the men choose to close with those terms, well and good; but he has no right also to stipulate that the men shall abstain from any unions they may choose to join. Nor is such a stipulation worth anything. So long as the terms mutually agreed upon are kept, it matters not whether the workmen frequent a union or not; when the men wish to change their employ, they must give notice according to agreement. If already *in* the union, they will do so as soon as the union resolves upon such a step. If kept out of it by the special clause of their agreement with their employers, they will in such circumstances leave their employ and enter the union. But the probability is, that with the bulk of the employed there is not so high and scrupulous a standard of honour as to prevent such an agreement from being simply nugatory, felt as it will be by them to be unjust against them, though they do not confess their similar injustice to the employers.

There never, perhaps, was a time when a strike was less called for, or more sure to fail, than now. The operative classes, and skilled workmen especially, never were better off than at present. Over-work, when necessary, is more than over-paid; that is, it is paid for at the rate of about three hours for two;—a sufficient check upon any disposition of the masters to resort to it needlessly.

The Amalgamated Society propose to establish co-operative works of their own. They have a perfect right to do this; and it is in some respects desirable, perhaps, that they should try the experiment. But the experiment, to be genuine, must not partake of a *charitable* character. Weak benevolence should not flatter itself it is doing good by giving money to such a purpose, or by lending it except in the purest way of business, *on good security* and *at ordinary interest*. Under these conditions it is desirable that the Amalgamated Society should work out the problem of employers and employed for

themselves. They will be at once the capitalists and "the hands;" the employers and the employed. They will have to meet the difficulties which beset large partnerships; and let them beware lest these speedily wreck their adventure. They will be too many masters; or, to avoid this difficulty, they must delegate supreme power, and try whether that can be done without fatal jealousies. They will soon see whether over-time is necessary, when good orders are to be refused as the alternative. They will have to decide whether it answers to employ skilled men in attending a self-acting lathe. If they prosper, it will be by learning the masters' side of the question. And the sooner they do this the better.

The article entitled "The Ethics of Christendom," will be recognized at once as from the same brilliant pen which has lately contributed to that new and strange department of the *Westminster*,—Theology. There is little, however, in the present article for Christendom fairly to find fault with, beyond certain exaggerations and one-sidednesses in that lurid illustration of some of the human phænomena of scripture, which gives as far as possible the appearance of error to overstated and distorted truth. And good taste has, as usual, to take exception against some of the most revolting metaphors that can defile a brilliant and prevailingly delicate and reverential pen. Think of a writer, whose topic is the apostolic mistake of anticipating some further (but not very distinctly imagined) consummation for "the end of the age," besides that of the destruction of Jerusalem and Judaism, and the consequent coming of the spiritual "kingdom of heaven," allowing himself thus to describe the state of mind in which the apostles, as he believes, habitually lived and thought and acted: "Now, if anything be certain on such a matter, it is that to suppose one's self in the world's last year (Paul, by the bye, does not say this; and "the age" lasted seven or eight years after his latest Epistles, and eighteen years after those [to the Thessalonians] in which he spoke most strongly of the coming catastrophe,—shewing, apparently, that the idea with him was not growingly prominent, at any rate),—the *admission paid to the panorama of judgment, and the spectacle only waiting to begin*,—is no small and sleepy idea." Far smaller as a theatrical exhibition, surely, than as an apostolic belief! Again, on this same subject, on which it is the reviewer's purpose to impress us with the practical influence which this belief in the coming end of the world had upon the apostles, he says,—"No one would build a house on ice melting with hidden fires; or freight ships over an ocean which earthquakes were to drain away; *or fabricate silks and patent leather for appearance at the last tribunal.*" Yet "the stern punctuality of hunger" continues; and "*Paul himself made sailcloth for a world on its last voyage.*" These are as atrocious sins against good taste as against sound scriptural criticism.

The first part of the article, we confess, is too difficult for us in its various proofs and illustrations of the leading idea, which it very concisely states, however, as regards the real contribution of Christianity to human Ethics, namely, "that the fundamental idea of Christendom may be described to be, the ascent through conscience into communion with God." By this somewhat affected phraseology we believe the reviewer means, the reconcilement, if not identification, of the *moral* and *devotional* faculties. And this is certainly a great result of Christianity. Yet it is very doubtful whether the founders of Christianity would have thus described their fundamental idea, or whether we ought to accept it on their behalf. Their chief ideas were of a universal Fatherly God, and his manifestation in Christ and the life everlasting; and hence came the proper union of the moral and religious elements. Nor is it quite so clear, on the reviewer's own showing, that this is the great idea of *Christendom* as distinguished from Christ and his apostles. He rightly insists that Paul's doctrine of faith is not the modern one; but, not content with the full scriptural explanation of "Faith *without the works of the* LAW," he says, "The apostle's demand for faith was a generous stimulant of hope to an invalided world" * * * "to paralytics that drag the foot, and cripples with worn-

out bodies and halting wills, at the baths of Baiæ." And then, coming to Luther's time, he truly and strongly points out the mischievous divorce effected by the Reformers between religion and morality, through *their* doctrine of *faith without works*. And the burden of the article thenceforth is to shew, sadly and too truly, how far the idea of Christendom is from "*ascending through conscience into communion with God.*" His biting sarcasm is appropriate enough to such a case as he here describes:

"The coolness with which people who live above the world sometimes avail themselves of its lowest verge of usages, is truly amazing. An affluent gentleman of high religious profession, subscriber to gospel schools, believer in prevenient grace, and otherwise the pride of the evangelical heart, found himself not insensible to the approach of the Hudson mania, speculated far beyond the resources of his fortune, declined to take up his bad bargains, and thus, at the expense of utter ruin to his agent, escaped with comparatively easy loss to himself. The agent, being but an honourable sinner of the worldly class, was struck down by the blow into great depression. His employer was enabled to take a more cheerful view, and on meeting his poor victim rallied him on his dejected looks and hopeless thoughts, so different from his own resigned and comfortable state of mind; 'but, ah! I forgot,' he added with a sigh—'you are not blest with my religious consolations!'"

This part of the article is fierce and fine. The reviewer goes on to say, however, that there are some churches, honourable exceptions to the prevailingly immoral tone of Christendom, in which this "antithesis between temporal and spiritual things" does not so prevail. "It runs into the greatest excess wherever the inherent pravity of human nature is most exaggerated." What, then, are the churches that form the honourable exceptions? Where is the *pravity* of human nature least exaggerated? Where is morality always made a part of religion? Is the Unitarian church present to the Westminster reviewer's mind as the most faithful to the idea of conscience in communion with God?

> "Oh no, we never mention her;
> That name is never heard;
> Our lips must now disdain to speak
> That once familiar word.
>
> "From sport to sport," &c.

The Catholic and the Arminian churches are mentioned (as they deserve to be, *after* the Unitarian); the Unitarian is not named at all. Is this being true to the great idea of Christendom?

But Dr. Arnold is mentioned much at large (as an Arminian in the Calvinistic church, we presume; the man who conformed while not believing the Articles, trusting that parish work would prove the creed true)—Arnold is eulogized as the great pattern of the true idea. The practice is better still, we think, than the idea, of conscience meeting God.

And what does our reviewer mean by the affectation of semi-orthodox phraseology — "Once fix the gaze of faith, the simplicity of trust on the Divine Human Being," &c.? Can the *Westminster* manage to keep easy with orthodoxy, while outraging, as it so often has done, the reasoning, deliberate, Christian convictions of Unitarians? The *Christian Reformer* can but protest against such mingled right and wrong as is here pointed out.

The survey, retrospective and contemporaneous, of the literature of America, contains much that is interesting. The writer is very moderately transcendental in his *stand-point.*

The Bible our Stumbling-block and our Strength:—a Tract for the Times. Pp. 32. London—John Chapman.

This "Tract for the Times" so far vindicates its claim to be thus designated, as it partakes largely of the assumption and mysticism which were characteristic of the notorious series of publications with this title which

a few years ago engaged the public attention—without, however, one particle of their dialectic subtlety. The writer takes as his motto on the title-page the indignant expostulation of our Lord with the crafty and tyrannical religious teachers of his own day, because they refused to "discern this time." They would have had an easy defence, if the impressive admonitions and convincing testimonies which were offered them had been as obscure and impracticable as those which the writer of this tract offers for correction and guidance. One excellent piece of advice he gives at the beginning, and this we have endeavoured to follow: "Be sincere with yourself" (p. 4); and as the result of our endeavour, we are obliged to confess that we really cannot even understand a very considerable part of what our author has written; no, not even that which he so formally introduces and so specifically (as it seems) *defines* on the authority of S. T. Coleridge; the definition being here, as in some other instances, as completely unintelligible to us as the thing to be defined. Two things, however, are plain enough, and in regard to both we entirely dissent from the views set forth in this pamphlet: 1. Having defined a *myth* to be "a legend unconsciously invented to be the vehicle of a truth, but, in its objective materials, altogether unfounded in fact" (p. 10), he proceeds to apply the hypothesis of a succession of these *myths* to explain the gradual formation of the Bible,—of the New Testament as well as of the Old; and conjectures (justly enough on such an hypothesis) that "there can be no end to records of revelation while the race [of man] exists" (p. 13). 2. He does not regard a miracle as impossible, but he cannot see how it is to be credibly related if it had ever taken place. "*Myth* at least is a much more likely solution of the anomaly than *fact*" (p. 18). Taking no more notice of the numerous and powerful replies which have been made to this sceptical assumption of Mr. Hume than if he had never heard of them (which we think by no means improbable), he records, however, one objection to this mythical hypothesis which presses no less strongly against Hume's assumption also,—an objection which he thinks "will occur to most readers, and which seems to have weighed powerfully with Dr. Arnold. In a letter to Bunsen, he says, 'But the idea of men writing mythical histories between the times of Livy and Tacitus, and of St. Paul mistaking such for realities!'" (p. 29). And again he quotes Arnold as saying, "How much more probable is it that miraculous narratives should be mere narrations of fact, than that men in that most practical age should have written myths" (p. 30). Our author's method of dealing with this conclusive objection completely satisfies us that, however skilful he may be, when meditating on "the mystic words" of the Bible, in "comprehending most luminously what" he "never dreamed of before, or in obtaining a glimpse of some truth which" he is "awed into believing without being able to understand"—(see page 17, for this mystical experience, on which *alone* our author seems to rest his faith in the Bible)—he is quite incapable of appreciating the force of an intelligent and intelligible argument, or of rightly understanding and applying those terms and processes of critical investigation with the use of which he affects so much familiarity.

After all that we have written, we can hardly help suspecting the pamphlet to be a burlesque, for the purpose of bringing into discredit (as it very effectually does) both the mythical and intuitional hypotheses. We the rather incline to this suspicion because of the cant phrases and ridiculous assumptions which are to be found in the pamphlet; as when the writer tells us (p. 9), after relating the story of the South-Sea Islander, and the chip on which Williams the missionary wrote a message to his wife, "Here we have an 'Aaron's rod' in cipher;"—and that "the personality of nature was once more *shelved:*" also when he sets before us so gravely (p. 25) the "profound significance" of the fact which he intimates that man has been "so many ages in reading," that "lobsters cast their shells, and endure the most excruciating agonies in the operation." What most of all induces us, however, to entertain this suspicion, is the astounding note "†*Ad clerum*"

near the end. The previous remarks, the writer tells us, are addressed "ad populum." He despairs of making plain the deeper wisdom of this note "to any but professed students in metaphysics." Let us recommend our author, however, if emulous of the burlesque style of writing, to study well the masterly "Historic Doubts respecting Napoleon Buonaparte," and the no less masterly "Historic Certainties respecting the Early History of America." He will then agree with us that this burlesque of his, however well intended, is a very clumsy affair indeed.

Three Letters to the Inhabitants of Kenilworth. By John Gordon. Pp. 23. Coventry, 1852.

The Rev. E. R. Eardley-Wilmot, the Vicar of Kenilworth, desires to be a great hereticorum malleus. We do not envy him his task in answering this pamphlet. The church anvil may resound with the labour, but the metal now before him is neither soft nor brittle. It seems that the Vicar lately issued a New-Year's Address to the inhabitants of his parish, in which he bewails the existence amongst them of the Unitarian chapel and its Sunday-school, and resents the teaching secular knowledge in the school and Unitarian doctrine in the chapel. Mr. Gordon's rebuke is powerful, its arguments closely logical, the whole illustrated happily by Scripture, and uttered in a style so plain and simple, that every word may be understood by the simplest Warwickshire rustic. To give a sample: after detailing certain unwarrantable interferences on the part of the Vicar with the Unitarian flock, Mr. Gordon proceeds:

"When Mr. Wilmot thinks he has detected such interference within his own community, on the part of a Catholic priest, his sense of dignity is, as you are aware, peculiarly keen. He exposes what he calls 'the work of proselyting;' he expresses great surprise at the 'use of priestly authority and power;' and he sets his face against efforts 'to work upon the superstitions and fears of a poor woman.' He may think he can reconcile his judgment, in the Romish case, with his behaviour in the Church-of-England one; just as he thinks that the sole headship of Christ, which he pleads against the supremacy of the Pope, can be reconciled with the supremacy of the Queen; but the sophistry is equally unsustainable in both instances, and to each of them may be applied the sentence, 'Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.'

"You may reasonably ask yourselves, how it happens that a person of Mr. Wilmot's station and education should place himself in the false position I have endeavoured to describe. It comes to pass, because he has conceived a notion that, as Vicar of the parish, he possesses certain spiritual rights over all the inhabitants of Kenilworth, whether they be members of his Church or not. Upon this fiction he acts. It gives the tone to his speech, as well as the impulse to his conduct. He is therefore continually trespassing upon decorum, under the impression that he is thereby fulfilling a religious duty. Now it is nothing better than an hallucination to which he thus commits himself. I have, in reality, just the same title to concern myself with the administration of his congregation, as he has to concern himself with the administration of mine; and what he would esteem an impertinent transaction on my part, is quite as great an impertinence on his part toward me. He must be instructed to confine the exercise of his authority to those who acknowledge that authority. I, and the persons who attend my ministry, do not acknowledge it. That he is the servant of the State gives him no superiority in our eyes. I commend him for opposing error and opposing truth, with the utmost zeal and perseverance, according to his own views of these things. There is, however, a natural circle to which his efforts of this kind are alone appropriate. I require him to keep within that circle, and to keep out of the one which has been appropriated to me; and I tell him plainly, that it is not 'the guilt of unfaithfulness,' but the charge of incivility he incurs, when he 'seeks *in every way* to counteract efforts' of which he does not approve."

In his Pastoral Address of 1853, Mr. Eardley-Wilmot will probably see reason to let Mr. Gordon and his flock alone.

INTELLIGENCE.

Rev. Charles Wellbeloved.

On Sunday, Feb. 1, this learned and venerable minister completed the 60th year of his ministry to the congregation assembling at St. Saviourgate chapel, York. It is a very remarkable fact that the period which has intervened since the passing of the Act of Uniformity in 1662, has been spanned by five ministers who have presided over the original congregation of Nonconformists at York. Rev. Ralph Ward, 1662—1692; Dr. Thomas Colton, 1692—1731; Rev. John Hotham, 1698—1756; Rev. Newcome Cappe, 1755—1800; Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, 1792—. On Monday, Feb. 2, the congregation, influenced by gratitude and respect, assembled and agreed to present to their aged and much-loved pastor the following address, which was signed by eighty-five members. Of these only one was a member of the congregation when, sixty years ago, Mr. Wellbeloved commenced his labours at St. Saviourgate.

"To the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved.

"Reverend and very dear Sir,—We the undersigned members of the congregation assembling for public worship in the Presbyterian Chapel, St. Saviourgate, York, and towards whom in the providence of God you have so long and so usefully sustained the relation of Pastor, desire in a brief address to present to you our congratulations, and to express with you our sympathies.

"We are accustomed to mark by some appropriate act or some suitable reflections the anniversary of any event which we feel to have had an important influence on us in our individual or social existence. Such an event we desire now to commemorate, by offering to you our sincere and affectionate congratulations upon the completion of the sixtieth year of your ministerial labours in this city.

"During this long period, great changes have taken place. Of those with whom this connection was originally formed, probably not one remains alive. Other changes, too, have taken place, of a less painful character than those effected by death. The denomination of Christians to which we belong, from being a proscribed sect and subject to disabilities on account of their religion, have taken their just place amongst their brethren, and by an Act of the legislature have obtained a legal existence and security for their property. The spirit of bigotry and persecution from which our fathers suffered, though not yet extinguished, is softened and restrained by the growing intelligence of the community; whilst the spread of scientific truth and the application of more correct principles of biblical criticism have abridged the distance which separated us from our opponents. While we congratulate you on this improvement, we remember that by your literary labours, directed by a sound judgment and a genuine piety, and by your dignified and Christian deportment, you have contributed much to promote it.

"We desire to record our unqualified admiration of your character as a Christian Teacher. With feelings of gratitude we call to mind your unwearied efforts to promote amongst us the cause of pure and undefiled religion, your exhortations to duty, your warnings against sin, your consolations in affliction; and we gladly acknowledge the great privilege we have enjoyed in having been permitted to hear the great principles of our faith and the sublime precepts of its Founder expounded and illustrated by one whose talents commanded our respect, and whose spirit of benevolence and Christian charity awakened in us the sentiments of reverence and love.

"We would also express our continued and increasing attachment to the great principles of religious freedom, and to those doctrines of Christianity which gather round and harmonize with the conviction of the absolute Unity of God,—doctrines and principles of which you have been so distinguished an exponent and champion; and it is our fervent and sincere aspiration that we may, by our life and conversation in the world, be enabled to recommend them to all who may apply the test furnished by Scripture, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.'

"We desire to convey to you, in your retirement from the active duties of life, the expression of our respectful and affectionate sympathy. If in the providence of Almighty God your bodily health should be so far re-established as to permit you again for a brief season to meet the members of

your congregation, we can assure you of the welcome of a grateful and affectionate people. If increasing infirmities should still withhold you from the sphere of your former usefulness, we cheerfully submit to the wise decrees of our Heavenly Father. We pray to Him that in your affliction you may be supported by a firm faith in His wisdom and goodness; that you may be cheered by the sublime hopes and the glorious promises of the Gospel; and that when He shall see fit to call you hence, you may enter upon the rest prepared for those who do well. And we also pray that at last we may all again meet, and that Pastor and People may rejoice together.

"With sentiments of reverence and love we subscribe ourselves.

"February 4th, 1852."

In his reply, Mr. Wellbeloved regretted that he was unable fully to express his feelings on receiving from his much-esteemed Christian friends this renewed and unexpected testimony of their affectionate regards towards him. Though he required not this additional proof of their esteem and friendship, it was highly gratifying to him, and he thanked them for it. That day was the sixtieth anniversary of the day on which his connection with the congregation assembling in the chapel in St. Saviour began. The period of that connection had been unusually long, but it had been a period of increasing satisfaction and comfort. In the earliest part of it, indeed, some circumstances occurred which were not very encouraging, but they soon passed away by the parental kindness and counsel of his revered predecessor and his excellent wife, the warm friendship of the other members of their family, and the continually increasing proofs of the approbation and esteem of those to whom he ministered. Every succeeding year of the long period which has passed has indeed justified the resolution which he early formed, that if he should be deemed worthy to be chosen as the successor of his venerated friend, so far as it depended upon himself, the connection with that Christian society should continue as long as his life should last. He hoped he was duly grateful to Divine Providence for having permitted him to enjoy so long the happiness he had anticipated. During so long a period great changes must unavoidably have happened. With one exception, all with whom he was first connected were gone. It was according to the course of nature that they who were then much older than himself should be removed from this world before him; but the grave had received those also who were younger than himself. One who was then very young, yet not the youngest, alone survives, and he was glad to see her then present. He rejoiced with them in the other changes which had taken place. It was a just subject of mutual congratulation and of gratitude to the Great Ruler of events that they had at length attained to the enjoyment of their civil and religious rights, and that the designs of the bigot had been checked and turned to our advantage. But he was afraid that the spirit of bigotry, though much restrained, was not subdued. Their religious principles were still generally misunderstood and, through ignorance perhaps, much misrepresented. It was encouraging, however, to observe that prejudice was gradually abating, and the most revolting articles in what are called orthodox creeds were giving place to such as were accordant with scripture and reason. To be amongst even the weakest instruments in the hands of Providence in producing so desirable a change, must be esteemed a very high privilege. It could not fail, he observed, to be a source of unspeakable satisfaction to him to receive from his beloved friends the assurance that his services amongst them as their minister had been acceptable and useful. He could truly say that their spiritual and moral improvement had been the great object at which he had aimed in all his services. Not to please the ear, not to captivate the imagination, but to affect and to amend the heart, and thus to sanctify the life, had been the principle by which his public instructions had been guided. He had been ever desirous that a better knowledge of the Word of God should strengthen both their motives and their resolution to do the will of God, and this end he kept in view when from time to time he explained to them the Scriptures: and when he endeavoured to confirm them in their attachment to the doctrines by the open profession of which they were distinguished as a Christian society, he uniformly endeavoured to shew them how eminently favourable these doctrines are to true piety and persevering virtue, and how powerful was the obligation to manifest the purity of their faith by the exemplary holiness of their life. He could not receive from them

this pleasing testimony of their approbation of his services as their minister, without expressing the great satisfaction and comfort he had experienced in witnessing the habitually serious and earnest attention with which they listened to the instructions that were delivered to them. More attentive hearers, he believed, could nowhere be found. They had appeared to him to bring with them to the house of prayer a spirit of true devotion; and by what he had observed of their life and conversation in the world, he thought he was justified in concluding that they received the word of exhortation with all readiness, that they might the more effectually perform all that the Lord their God required of them. He had no reason to doubt that they would firmly maintain their attachment to the great principles of religious freedom and to the pure doctrines of Christianity which they had upon mature deliberation embraced, and that by their good conduct they would recommend them to others. The interests of true religion and virtue were indeed closely connected with the diffusion of those doctrines. They were the surest antidote to the infidelity that so unhappily prevails on the one hand, and to the fanaticism and superstition which are extending their baneful influence on the other. He most cordially thanked them for the kind expression of their sympathy, and for their earnest prayers on his behalf. As to the renewal of his public services even for a brief season, he could not encourage any hope. His work in relation to them had been his delight. But that work was finished. Such he thought was the will of God, and to that he unreluctantly submitted. He gratefully acknowledged his obligations to Mr. Kenrick for so frequently occupying his place, and was happy to have so able and zealous an assistant as Mr. Palmer. If it should please Divine Providence to permit him to meet his beloved friends as a fellow-worshiper with them even for a short time, it would be most truly gratifying to him, and excite his warmest gratitude. He concluded by expressing his ardent hope that, when the work of all should be done and they should be no longer in this world, they might meet again in a world of never-ending felicity and unblemished holiness, and by "commending them to God and to the word of his grace, which is able to build them up and to give them an inheritance among all them who are sanctified."

It is stated by our excellent contemporary, the *Inquirer*, in its brief notice of these interesting proceedings, that though Mr. Wellbeloved's "late illness has left some bodily weakness behind it, he is enabled still to occupy himself in those studies to which his life has been so usefully devoted."

Sheffield.

The Rev. Thomas Hincks, B. A., of Exeter,* has accepted an unanimous invitation from the congregation assembling in the Upper chapel, Sheffield, to become their minister, as successor to the Rev. B. T. Stannus, and will commence his duties in this place about Midsummer.

* We have received from Mr. J. D. Osborne, the Chairman of a meeting of the Exeter congregation held Feb. 1st, the resolution expressive of regret at the departure of Mr. Hincks, and recording their sense of the value of his services; but as the document has already appeared in the pages of the *Inquirer*, it is not necessary for us to insert it. The resolution is highly honourable to Mr. Hincks and creditable to the Exeter congregation.

MARRIAGES.

1851. May 3, at the Presbyterian chapel, Banbury, Mr. James Clark to Miss Harriet Potter.

June 5, at the Presbyterian chapel, Banbury, Mr. John Mann to Miss Elizabeth Potter.

Oct. 28, Mr. William Potts, Jun., to Miss Eliza Milward, of Neithrop House.

1852. Jan. 27, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. F. Baker, M. A., Mr. George Hawksworth to Ann, daughter of Mr. John Jones, of Bolton.

Jan. 28, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. F. Baker, M. A., Mr. Thomas Yates to Rachel, daughter of Mr. James Fray, of Edge Ford, near Bolton.

OBITUARY.

At Hampstead, December 14, 1851, in the 34th year of her age, CHARLOTTE, only surviving daughter of the late Rev. John MORELL, LL. D.; and on the 12th January following, in her 73rd year, ELIZABETH, her widowed mother.

Many were the gentle virtues and unostentatious accomplishments by which the character of Miss Morell was distinguished,—many were the fine qualities of her mind. Her understanding was strengthened by a careful education and disciplined by habitual study and reflection, and a residence of many years in foreign countries had increased her stores of information. The simplicity of her character and the purity of her heart, together with the cheerfulness and serenity of her temper, endeared her to her family and to a large circle of friends and acquaintance. Her health had been always delicate, but not such as to excite apprehensions of the blow which so suddenly snatched her from the arms of her fondly affectionate mother. That mother, whose whole life had been anxiously devoted to her children, and whose tender and sensitive nature was ill fitted to sustain the bereavements with which it pleased Heaven to try her fortitude and faith, sank, smitten of God and afflicted, under the loss of her beloved daughter, and after the lapse of one month of deep and bitter sorrow she was gently and mercifully released from her sufferings, and re-united to the child she had loved so well and lost so sadly.

This excellent lady, the last of a family of seven sons and two daughters, the children of that most estimable man, the Rev. John Reynell, of Thorverton, Devon, was endowed with many sterling virtues. Her goodness and kindness were known to all who enjoyed her friendship. Her sympathies were warm and strong; she possessed a most kind and loving nature, and, though infirm in health and frail in constitution, she made many and great sacrifices to promote the welfare of those in whom she was interested. A more conscientious and high-minded woman never lived; but feelings "all too delicate for use" sometimes rendered her too keenly alive to the sorrows of others as well as of her own. Deep was her love of God, and of all things fair, amiable and good; and many are they who will cherish and revere her memory as the memory of one who was eminently good and kind and just and true. Numerous and severe were the trials she endured, and those who loved her best, while mourning for her loss, will scarcely regret that it has pleased the Almighty Father to release her from the burden of her cares, and to take her to himself and to that rest and peace which remaineth for the people of God.

To this sad record must now be added the name of another honoured member of this family; for since the foregoing lines were written Death has again made inroads on its circle, and closed the earthly career of that venerable and excellent man, the Rev. STEPHEN MORELL, eldest brother of the late [illegible] Morell.

During a period of fifty-three years he had been the devoted and beloved pastor of an Independent congregation at Little Baddow, in Essex. On the Sunday previous to his death he preached with his accustomed fervour from the text, "And now, O Father, glorify me," and on the Friday following, February 13, his pure and gentle spirit passed peacefully and painlessly away from earth. Although an octogenarian, the energy, cheerfulness and activity by which throughout his long life he had been distinguished were but little impaired even to the last. Few men ever so completely exemplified in their own character and conduct the idea conveyed by the Psalmist in that sweet expression, the *Beauty of Holiness*.—Of an eminently catholic spirit, he loved all good men of every creed and sect, and he made all who came within the sphere of his influence happier and better. Faithfully and affectionately he discharged the duties of a country minister to a flock who loved and honoured him as their father,—as their guide, companion, counsellor and friend,—and to their temporal as well as spiritual necessities he ministered with all a father's care, solicitude and zeal. Blest in his family and delighting in his pious duties, he thankfully and placidly enjoyed the present state of being, and regarded it as but a pleasant foretaste of the better world which lies beyond, and to which he looked forward with steady hope and unwa-

vering faith. Beautiful in life and death was the condition of this holy and happy man, and sweet is the memory he has left behind him.

J. R. W.

Jan. 18, after a very short illness, MARGARET ISABEL, third daughter of Thomas TODD, Esq., of Dewsbury, Yorkshire.

Jan. 22, at his father's house, High Street, Guildford, Surrey, FRANK, eldest son of Mr. John CROSSKEY. This amiable boy was removed by consumption, after a lingering illness of considerably more than a year. He had only just left school, and had been taken into his father's shop, when the seeds of disease began to shew themselves; and his illness so rapidly increased that he was soon obliged to give up all attention to business. During the greater part of the last year he was in a state of great languor, but not an expression of impatience escaped him. As the year drew to a close, the progress of disease occasioned him great suffering; but the same spirit of resignation accompanied him through this season of severer trial; and he received with thankfulness and pleasure the attentions rendered him by the watchful and affectionate care of his parents and by the kindness of friends. The circumstance that the congregation to which his parents belonged (Mead Row, Godalming) was without a settled minister during the latter part of his long illness, prevented his receiving those pastoral attentions which at such seasons are so precious; but he was much pleased when any occasion brought them for the time within his reach, and aided him to cherish that Christian hope which cheered his last moments. His remains were buried in the beautiful ground attached to the meeting-house at Mead Row, on the 30th January, the last offices of religion being rendered by Mr. Means of Chatham, under whom he had finished his education, and whose affectionate regard he had won by his docility and amiable character.

Feb, 8, at Knutsford, aged 25 years, GEORGE MADDOX. He had been for some years the teacher of the boys' day-school in connection with the Presbyterian chapel, Bury, and enjoyed in a remarkable degree the confidence, the esteem and the affection, both of the scholars and of their parents. His influence over the minds of his pupils was always of an improving and elevating character, so that he not only gave them instruction, but inspired them with the love of goodness. He was particularly kind and consolatory in his visits of Christian sympathy and edification to any of his scholars or friends in their sickness. Not only did he excel in the faithful and cordial discharge of his duties as a son, a brother and a friend, but it seemed to be the constant aim of his life to do good to all. He appeared to have given himself up to the service of God as a follower of Christ, and to have felt it his duty to improve himself and others to the utmost. And his efforts were crowned with success. He exercised a quiet and holy influence over the minds of the older scholars and teachers of the Sunday-school, and many other young persons of the congregation of which he was a member. With earnestness he entered into the various proceedings devised for their improvement, and especially into those which had for their object the cherishing of the life of God in the soul of man. He occasionally conducted public worship at Newchurch and at Rawtenstall, as well as led the devotions of a class of young men at Bury. But his labours were by no means equal to his desires; the spirit was willing, but the flesh was weak. He suffered much from ill health the last ten years of his life. His long affliction was borne with pious resignation, and death was received as God's messenger of love,—his last words, after expressions of affection to parents and friends, being, "Heaven! heaven! heaven!" Amongst those who attended his funeral were the Independent minister and the Baptist minister of Knutsford, besides members of other religious denominations, and about eighteen young men of the Knutsford Temperance Society, he having been a zealous supporter of the Temperance movement. His remains were interred in the yard of the Presbyterian chapel, Knutsford. The Rev. Henry Green conducted the service, assisted by the minister of the Presbyterian chapel, Bury. "Though the righteous be prevented with death, yet shall he be in rest; for honourable age is not that which standeth in length of time, nor that is measured by number of years; but wisdom is the grey hair unto men, and an unspotted life is old age."